Latino Migrant Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Occupational Health and Safety Education and the Sustainability of Agriculture

A Dissertation Submitted to the
College of Graduate Studies and Research
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
In the School of Environment and Sustainability
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán

PERMISSION TO USE STATEMENT

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this dissertation in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my dissertation work or, in their absence, by the Executive Director of the School of Environment and Sustainability in which my thesis work was done:

Executive Director
School of Environment and Sustainability
University of Saskatchewan
Room 323, Kirk Hall
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5C8
Canada
Phone: (306) 966-1985
Fax: (306) 966-2298
Email: sens.info@usask.ca

It is understood that any copying, or publication or use of this dissertation or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation. I certify that the present version of my dissertation is the same as that approved by my advisory committee.

ABSTRACT

In Saskatchewan, there is a dearth of scholarly documentation on the experiences of Latino migrant temporary farmworkers, especially with respect to their agricultural occupational health and safety (OHS) education and training. Other research suggests that, in Canada and the USA, systematic agricultural OHS training for Latino migrant temporary farmworkers is generally insufficient and, in many cases, linguistically and culturally inappropriate. The overall purposes of this dissertation are to investigate the major challenges with respect to Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training, to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges. A blended theoretical framework incorporates the social dimensions of sustainable development in agriculture, adult education theory, innovative approaches to worker agricultural OHS education and training, critical ethnography, as well as a socioecological model of health. Critical ethnography influenced the field methodology and the interpretation of field data. As both theory and methodology, critical ethnography includes sensitivities to the challenges of intercultural communication. A thematic analysis was used to condense field interview data and to identify major themes and sub-themes. Three main themes were examined: 1) Language barriers as factors in workplace communications and workplace tensions, 2) Attitudes towards OHS learning and practices, and 3) Work organization and workplace culture as factors complicating access to English language learning. The study finds that language barriers, personal and workplace cultural factors, as well as certain aspects of migratory labour regimes and seasonal agricultural work are the major challenges to Latino farmworker OHS education, training, and learning. I conclude that Latino migrant temporary farmworkers need to receive English language training and more OHS education and training to address unsafe habits, particularly with respect to working with agricultural equipment. Language barriers and cultural factors have the potential to put both migrant and local personnel OHS at risk. Employment contracts under agricultural temporary foreign worker programs contribute to a culture of work that is focused primarily on productivity. They also contribute to preventing most Latino farmworkers from engaging in educational initiatives and from looking after their general and occupational health.

Employment arrangements and conditions are also important factors that result in migrant farmworkers struggling with issues of powerlessness, family separation, isolation, and stress—circumstances that are not favourable to studying and learning nor to cultivating new health and safety habits. Effective educational communication for farmworker OHS preparation is important to ensuring the physical, mental, and social wellbeing of Latino temporary migrant farmworkers. The promotion of such wellbeing contributes to moving agriculture towards social sustainability. It is recommended that, at each workplace where Latino migrant temporary farmworkers are employed, a fully bilingual professional also be employed to act as a liaison among stakeholders and assist them with interpretation and translation. Additionally, to ensure the wellbeing of both migrant and local personnel, program stakeholders need to implement alternatives to hourly-based contracts. An important conceptual and concrete contribution of the study is that it provides an alternative adult education approach to conventional agricultural occupational health and safety promotion. In doing so, it also questions occupational health and safety frameworks that focus too exclusively on medical and engineering/technical dimensions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge all the farmworkers, their employers, and other key informants who participated in this dissertation. I would particularly like to acknowledge and thank the members of Saskatchewan's civil society who were crucial in connecting with agricultural employers who hire Latino migrant farmworkers. I am also thankful to the members of my Student Advisory Committee—Dr. Shelley Kirychuk, Dr. Ken Norman, Dr. Kara Somerville, and Dr. David Natcher—for their guidance and assistance, and particularly my supervisor, Dr. Michael Gertler. I am likewise thankful to Dr. Ken Belcher for ably chairing committee meetings and for the orientation provided. I want as well to extend my appreciation to the faculty and staff of the School of Environment and Sustainability at the University of Saskatchewan, particularly to Dr. Toddi Steelman, Dr. Maureen Reed, Dr. M.J. Barrett, and Mrs. Irene Schwalm. Special thanks to Dr. Elizabeth Quinlan for teaching me the fundamentals of qualitative/thematic data analysis. Thank you as well to friends and peers whose support and encouragement were vital.

I would also like to acknowledge the financial assistance that I received from The Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Strategic Training Program in Public Health and the Agricultural Rural Ecosystem (PHARE), from the School of Environment and Sustainability (SENS) and the College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR) at the University of Saskatchewan, and from the Canadian Centre for Health and Safety in Agriculture (CCHSA). Special thanks to the CCHSA-PHARE community, particularly Dr. Shelley Kirychuk, Dr. James Dosman, Dr. Donna Rennie, Dr. Niels Koehncke, and Mrs. Sueli de Freitas. I would like to extend my appreciation and gratitude to all the aforementioned professionals and agencies that provided me with support and with funding for my doctoral program.

Heartfelt thanks go to my parents for their support over the years. I dedicate this doctoral thesis to them. Without their encouragement and support, I would not have achieved my goals. Thanks for everything!

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Overview

For many decades, Canadian farmers have been faced with chronic labour shortages (Colby 1997; Trumper & Wong, 1997; Preibisch, 2007; Binford, 2013). In an attempt to resolve this labour supply problem, the Canadian government established *guest* worker programs in the agricultural sector starting in 1966 with migrant farmworkers from the Caribbean (Basok, Bélanger, & Rivas, 2014). Since then, additional agreements have targeted the recruitment of workers from Latin America, particularly Mexico, but also other countries such as Nicaragua (Binford, 2006; Hennebry & McLaughlin, 2012; Binford, 2013; Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). Temporary migrant farmworkers have become an important source of labour that contributes to the economic viability and profitability of many Canadian farms (Binford, 2006; Hennebry & McLaughlin, 2012; Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). Despite their contribution to the development of agriculture in Canada and in many other parts of the world, migrant farmworkers experience undesirable working conditions such as low pay, limited access to social services, lack of information, as well as minimal occupational health and safety (OHS) education and training and union support (McLaughlin, 2009; McLaughlin, Hennebry, & Haines, 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). These detrimental working conditions raise questions—or should raise questions—about the human/social dimensions of agricultural sustainability (Hurst, Termine, & Karl, 2007; Amponsah-Tawiah, 2013).

The reality surrounding agricultural temporary worker programs includes many complex issues. Scholars working in various parts of Canada have enumerated the challenges that temporary migrant farmworkers face (Smart, 1997; Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; Otero & Preibisch, 2010; Pysklywec, McLaughlin, Tew, & Haines, 2011; Horgan, 2012; Read, Zell, & Fernandez, 2013; Narushima & Sanchez, 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). These challenges can be broadly categorized as follows: problems with ill health, unsafe working conditions, and lack of access to health care services as well as sociocultural isolation and limited opportunities to learn the English language. These issues have been studied by researchers from a variety of disciplines and interdisciplinary perspectives including human geography, migration studies, public policy,

labour studies, gender studies, law, and human rights (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008). Relatively little research has focused on worker agricultural occupational health and safety (OHS) education and training (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008). However, studies conducted in Canada and the USA suggest that training in agricultural OHS frequently remains insufficient or nonexistent (Arcury, Estrada & Quandt, 2010). Where training is offered, it is frequently ineffective and/or culturally inappropriate for Latino migrant farmworkers and other low income/low literacy migrant farmworkers (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; McLaughlin, 2009; Arcury et al., 2010; Spears, Summers, Spencer, & Arcury, 2012; Flocks, Mac, Runkle, Tovar-Aguilar, Economos, & McCauley, 2013; Read et al., 2013; Ziesman, 2013; McLaughlin et al., 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). To better understand the training needs of temporary migrant farmworkers, it will be necessary for researchers to focus on the context of the training, on language barriers, on cultural and social attributes of the workers, as well as on their experiences in the workplace (Arcury et al., 2010).

With regard to agricultural OHS training in Canada, learning processes in the context of temporary foreign worker programs are typically based on knowledge sharing among workers themselves and on what their supervisors teach them (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; Preibisch & Otero, 2014; Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015). For example, at some farms in British Columbia, because of a lack of effective, culturally appropriate, and timely training, some Mexican and Asian farmworkers only learned health and safety practices by exchanging information with each other, or with supervisory personnel via hand signals, or through brief practical demonstrations provided by supervisors (Fairey et al., 2008; Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015). Furthermore, language barriers and cultural differences have also contributed significantly to cultural alienation among Latino farmworkers employed in the Canadian agriculture sector (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008). While some employers hire interpreters at specific moments and for specific purposes, Latino migrant farmworkers employed in rural Canada typically lack reliable or certified interpretation services at their worksites or where they access health services (McLaughlin, 2009; Mysyk, 2009). Latino migrant farmworker experiences with agricultural OHS education and training in Saskatchewan have not been documented, nor have needs, barriers, and opportunities with respect to advancing such preparation. This applies in particular to individuals that come to Saskatchewan as part of the Temporary Foreign Worker

Program (TFWP) in the agriculture sector. Worker OHS experiences and learning contexts are important research gaps that need to be addressed (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; Narushima & Sanchez, 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014).

OHS training is key to protecting the lives of workers and employers. With high rates of fatalities and work-related injuries, agriculture is recognized to be one of the most dangerous industries worldwide (Pickett, Hartling, Brison, & Guernsey, 1999; Ross, 2006; Lundqvist & Day, 2010; Pfortmueller, Kradolfer, Kunz, Lehmann, Lindner, & Exadaktylos, 2013; Swanberg, Clouser, Browning, Westneat, & Marsh, 2013; Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). In Saskatchewan, agriculture has also been identified as one of the most hazardous sectors to work in (Government of Saskatchewan, 2015). Farm machinery-related injuries accounted for 46% of all serious (hospitalized) injuries and 77% of all fatal injuries (Hagel, Pahwa, Dosman, & Pickett, 2013, p. 157).

1.2. Assumptions, Purposes, and Research Questions

Farm labour regimes that pay significant attention to and invests seriously in worker OHS education and training contribute to moving agriculture towards sustainability. Appropriate OHS messages and effective communications[1] in the workplace are vital to ensuring the safety and overall health and wellbeing of farm personnel, which is an important aspect of the sustainability of agriculture. Lack of significant action on agricultural OHS and agricultural OHS education and training raises questions about the social and environmental sustainability of agricultural production sites and production regimes. These issues relate to all agricultural workers, not only migrant workers. However, in the context of temporary foreign worker programs, intercultural communications and cross-cultural appropriateness pose additional challenges. Addressing these problems in an adequate manner is a nontrivial challenge that requires creative, sustained, and coordinated efforts by many stakeholders.

[1] The term communication is pluralized to indicate that communication issues are complex, involve two-way exchanges, and rely on multiple modalities—written and spoken words, non-verbal signals, and contextualizing practices and messaging, for example.

In the context of this dissertation, agricultural sustainability—especially in its social and environmental dimensions—is taken to include the promotion of the physical, mental, and social wellbeing of migrant farmworkers involved in agricultural enterprises. One key aspect of this is, perforce, the provision of culturally, socially, and linguistically appropriate OHS information, education, and training. Farm work has inherent risks that may be exacerbated by social conditions. Unequal access to relevant information and OHS education, combined with workplace cultures that focus attention primarily on production and labour productivity, may create or increase certain risks and vulnerabilities (see Arcury et al., 2010). Given that farms employing Latino migrant labourers are highly dispersed in the Prairie West, groups of migrant farmworkers employed on these farms may be especially isolated. They risk being an unknown or "invisible" population both locally and in the Prairie provinces as a whole. The relatively small numbers of Latino migrant farmworkers employed in provinces such as Saskatchewan may also contribute to the aforementioned invisibility and consequently affect educational initiatives.

In a globalized market economy, and in the context of dominant neoliberal policy discourses, farmworkers employed in temporary foreign worker programs are considered unskilled or low-skilled workers. The employment of (foreign) workers possessing relatively little formal education and few educational credentials helps to justify/excuse low wages and helps to ensure that this will be a more compliant, dedicated, and deferential workforce (see Preibisch & Otero, 2014 and Otero & Preibisch, 2015). While the labelling of agricultural workers as unskilled can itself be critiqued on a number of grounds, suffice it here to point out an apparent inconsistency: if they are really unskilled or low-skilled, they must be especially in need of general job preparation and specific agricultural OHS education and training—not to mention general education, basic literacy training, and English language training.

The overall purposes of this dissertation are to describe the major challenges of Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training (including needs and barriers), to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges. I ask the following questions that delineate the direction and scope of my dissertation:

1. What are the major challenges that farmworkers encounter when it comes to learning how to protect their health and work safely, and particularly, what are the lived experiences of farmworkers with respect to these challenges?
2. What are the implications of related interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts (or circumstances) for farmworker OHS education and training?
3. What are the options for moving forward on migrant farmworker OHS education and training, and what should be considered in designing such interventions/programs?

1.3. Significance and Rationale of the Study

The labour of migrant farmworkers helps to make Canadian agricultural enterprises economically sustainable but these workers need additional education and training so that their work becomes more sustainable for them as well. The adequate provision of general education and work-related training (for employees and employers) should help to make Canadian agricultural workplaces safer and healthier, and is thus essential for advancing the sustainability of agriculture. It is also a key element in advancing relations between labour-sending and receiving countries (Preibisch, 2007; Lapointe, 2010). For example, the provision of appropriate pre-departure information/orientation sessions to migrant farmworkers can contribute to ensuring the health and safety of both migrant and non-migrant (local) farm personnel.

Pang (2013) points out that the contributions of temporary migrant farmworkers are becoming increasingly important, and that their presence in Canada has grown. It is widely claimed that many Canadian agricultural enterprises need such workers in order to remain competitive and economically viable; in their absence, certain labour-intensive agricultural businesses would go bankrupt (Smart, 1997; Basok, 2002; Preibisch, 2007, 2010; Russo, 2011; Hennebry & McLaughlin, 2012; Lenard & Straehle, 2012; Pang, 2013; Read et al., 2013). For certain agricultural subsectors at least, the reality in Saskatchewan is similar as these activities might not be economically viable without assured access to migrant workers (Poirier, 2010).

The present study is important because it expands the scope of scholarship on agricultural OHS education and training for migrant farmworkers. The study incorporates alternative approaches to adult education as well as an approach to sustainability that includes a broader understanding of social wellbeing and workplace cultures. In doing so, it also challenges conventional agricultural occupational health and safety frameworks that focus too exclusively on workplace risk assessments and hazard identification in the interest of reducing accidents and injuries. This study points to the need to go beyond short-term timeframes and beyond medical and engineering/technical lenses in ways that engage more fully with longer-term health risks, with influential structural factors, and with stakeholder values, emotions, cultures, and philosophies. As argued by Benach, Muntaner, Benavides, Amable, and Jodar (2002), "contrary to the common belief, in many occupational health circles, emergent occupational health hazards should not be approached only as 'technical or economic' value-free problems. Rather, many of the new challenges faced by occupational health policy are predominantly related to professional values in response to emerging changes in labor relations" (p. 191). Not infrequently, medical and/or engineering/technical lenses frame occupational health and safety too narrowly, that is, without considering important social aspects and human factors such as the social relations of production (e.g., employer-employee and employee-employee relations), (see Benach et al., 2002) and the migration process itself.

Especially when some psychological insights are integrated, medical/health and engineering/technical lenses may be combined in ways that qualify as interdisciplinary. However, such mainstream approaches to OHS typically pay little or no attention to socially complex relationships and interactions between and among employers and employees. This includes issues such as the fairness of employment contracts, employer-employee power differentials, gender differences/relations, cultural/ethnical differences, as well as the personal and collective experiences, perspectives, and histories of the workers and employers involved. Mainstream approaches to OHS typically aim to preserve worker health and safety through specific workplace injury and illness prevention procedures (sometimes known as the "hierarchy of controls"), which may include the identification, assessment, elimination (or reduction) of hazards/risks, provision of training, as well as the use of personal protective equipment and safety devices (ILO, 2011). Not infrequently, medical and engineering/technical approaches focus attention on a small subset

of workplace hazards/risk factors. This kind of narrowed focus stems from, and perpetuates, an incomplete understanding of OHS issues and processes (see Walters, 1985; Stallones, Vela, Sample, Bigelow, & Rosales, 2009). By engaging with gaps in OHS practices and conceptualizations, the present study endeavours to contribute to the development of agricultural OHS as a field of scholarly enquiry and at the same time to provide practical recommendations for sector stakeholders. These recommendations are intended to enable sector stakeholders to mount OHS educational initiatives that are more socially, culturally, and linguistically appropriate for migrant farmworkers of various backgrounds.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study

This dissertation looks at structural and sociocultural challenges that have implications for Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training. Although it is important that farmer-employers as well as some other relevant and significant informants were interviewed, the experiences of Latino migrant farmworkers are at the centre of this study and have been its central focus. As mentioned, the thesis looks at the relatively small and understudied population of temporary/ seasonal migrants employed by agricultural enterprises in Saskatchewan under temporary labour programs—and it is particularly focused on Latino migrant farmworkers from Mexico and Nicaragua. Worker OHS education and training was considered from different perspectives that are explained further in the section on theoretical frameworks. Moreover, given their implications for worker ability and willingness to be involved in educational activities, certain conditions of employment such as hourly-based contracts and work schedules were also considered.

Given its concerns, this dissertation is necessarily interdisciplinary. The intersecting scholarly fields that are particularly germane to this study are: 1) social dimensions of sustainable development in agriculture, 2) adult education, 3) agricultural OHS education and training, and 4) critical ethnography. Of course, the study is also delimited by its initial purpose and the research questions that have evolved out of studying and identifying gaps in relevant literature. These questions have been further refined and sharpened in the process of intensive interaction with the various kinds of evidence gathered in the process of doing the field research.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter initially reviews literature that addresses the importance and contributions of migrant farmworkers employed in Canadian agriculture under Temporary Foreign Worker Programs (TFWP). A summary of the history and general characteristics of two subprograms of the TFWP, the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP)[2] and the Agricultural Stream (AS), is presented. The purpose of presenting a summary of the major characteristics of these two programs is to provide context to better understand the employment conditions of Latino migrant farmworkers employed under both subprograms. Subsequent sections review specific aspects of migrant farmworkers' OHS (un)preparation such as language and cultural barriers to learning, and unmet education and training needs. The implications of agricultural OHS education and training that is not linguistically, socially, or culturally appropriate are also discussed. Available research dealing with the aforementioned issues in various Canadian locales is presented so that it is possible to compare and contrast findings from other provinces with the situation found in the Province of Saskatchewan. I also discuss research methodologies and methods that other researchers have used to study migrant temporary farm labour in other Canadian provinces. In the chapter summary, I synthesize the major contributions of the scholarly research literature and discuss important research gaps. Finally, I review recommendations made by other Canadian researchers with respect to how to improve migrant farmworker agricultural OHS education and training.

2.2. International Migration of Agricultural Workers and their Contributions

Hurst, Termine, and Karl (2007) report that, out of 1.1 billion agricultural workers in the world, 450 million are waged agricultural workers whose contributions to feeding the world and producing fiber is invaluable. However, these workers face significant social (in)justice challenges (Geiser & Rosenberg, 2006). Unfortunately, many migrants are "relegated to the 'three D'—dirty, dangerous and degrading—jobs that national workers reject or are not available

[2] Officially known in Mexico as the Programa de Trabajadores Agrícolas Temporales México-Canadá (PTAT).

for" (ILO, 2006, p. 1). The ILO (2006) notes that migrant workers promote growth and development of the economies of both receiving and sending nations. Workers send home remittances that help to sustain families left behind, to build them more substantial homes, and to defray the costs of local development and civic improvement projects (Binford, 2003). Migrants returning to their hometowns have acquired new competencies learned in the receiving country, and have been able to apply new knowledge and new technologies (ILO, 2006). Labour problems in agriculture and the problems faced by agricultural workers have been widely discussed at international summits organized by the International Labour Organization. Since the inception of this organization, a wide range of issues related to the experiences of workers employed in various agricultural subsectors and in various countries have been discussed. These issues include the (frequently unmet) needs for literacy and numeracy education, for general job training, as well as for OHS education and training (Hurst et al., 2007; ILO, 2010; ILO, 2011).

In many countries, migrant farmworkers do not have legal or political rights; they are seen as a disposable and docile group of farmhands who can be easily deported if they—from the employer's or contractor's perspective—become "problematic" or are no longer needed (Dixon, Jonas, & McCaughan, 1982; Bolaria, 1988; Faraday, 2012; Pang, 2013). Preibisch and Otero (2014) have argued that temporary foreign worker programs in agriculture contribute to making migrant farmworkers more vulnerable (and therefore disciplined and docile) because of the lack of permanent residence/citizenship and the threat of termination along with deportation from Canada. Faraday (2012) states that "there is no requirement for the employer to provide a worker with the opportunity to know or respond to the reasons for their termination and no mandated process through which the merits of the termination can be adjudicated" (p. 94). Basok, Bélanger, and Rivas (2014) assert that the risk of being terminated/deported contributes to making migrant farmworkers more productive and deferential. Basok et al. point out that if migrant farmworkers dare to raise complaints, they risk not being offered employment again. Preibisch and Otero (2014) suggest that, because of employment termination and deportation risks, migrant farmworkers are willing to accept unfair employment conditions and dangerous tasks. In the opinion of McLaughlin (2009), migrant farmworkers work hard with little or no complaint in order to distinguish themselves as good workers and make a positive impression with their employers.

Workers do this because they are eager for the earnings and because they hope to be offered employment again the following season. McLaughlin (2009) states that, because in Mexico (and elsewhere in Latin America) there is a "reserve army of labour" (p. 53), migrants feel and experience additional pressure knowing that hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals (men and women) are waiting for an opportunity to participate in temporary foreign worker programs in Canada. Workers know that their Canadian employers are aware that many candidates are available in labour-sending countries, and that they can be easily replaced (McLaughlin, 2009). The effect of this "reserve army of labour" is to exacerbate the vulnerability of migrant farmworkers because even the most inconsequential lapse or fault, and raising even a minor complaint, may be enough to put their contracts at risk (McLaughlin, 2009).

If migrant farmworkers had access to permanent residency status in Canada, they would be able to apply for jobs in other sectors and have access to various educational opportunities. They would also feel less vulnerable given that the threat of deportation would not hang over them (Preibisch & Otero, 2014). While the possibility of deportation is real and is experienced as a tangible threat, the actual rate of deportation is fairly low. In the case of Mexican migrant farmworkers, for example, Basok et al. (2014) report that, between 2004 and 2011, the annual deportation rate for Mexican migrant farmworkers was less than 1.5%. Given that these workers are highly motivated and eager to please, and given that there are advantages to working with a crew that already knows the operation, the vast majority of Canadian employers prefer to offer employment to the same migrant farmworkers year after year (Basok et al., 2014).

Latino migrant farmworkers are seen as desirable employees in part because they are flexible and compliant—willing to work almost any hours at almost any task, without complaint or resistance (SCLC, 2002; Faraday, 2012). Their flexibility and docility can be better understood if their contemporary realities and historical experiences are appreciated. The social impacts of colonization, for example, should be taken into account. Due to the Spanish and Portuguese colonization of Latin America, subordinated groups were not able to freely express their own values and beliefs, and they had to avoid confronting landowners and administrators whose power was absolute (Redclift & Goodman, 1991; Bhola, 2006). Many Latin American people

lived in extreme poverty and were subject to slavery and other forms of exploitation enforced by occupying armies (Redclift & Goodman, 1991).

The colonizers brought with them horses and military capability along with a sense of superiority and a different language and religion. They imposed labour regimes and military, political, economic, religious, and cultural hierarchies that allowed them to exercise power over indigenous populations and to amass great wealth (Redclift & Goodman, 1991; Bhola, 2006). The economic, land tenure, and agricultural systems that indigenous peoples had created over generations were dismantled and displaced (Redclift & Goodman, 1991). The best agricultural lands were taken by the Spaniards and indigenous peoples were forced to relocate to less desirable locations (Redclift & Goodman, 1991). Many indigenous people resigned themselves to live in isolation and vulnerability, while those who were not forced to live in the highlands became labourers for the Spanish or Portuguese owners of what were previously indigenous lands (Redclift & Goodman, 1991; Prem, 1992). As labourers they were subject to exploitation and to disciplinary strategies that made them accept long hours of work. The colonizers and the indigenous labourers became dependent on each other: the former for the labour needed to generate and maintain wealth, and the latter to survive (Prem, 1992).

In developing countries, the increasing displacement or industrialization of agricultural activities, lack of alternative employment, and deepening poverty have led to a local oversupply of agricultural labourers who are willing to accept employment in industrialized nations where, ironically, there is a growing demand and market for agricultural labourers (Strigini, 1982; Martin, Abella, & Kuptsch, 2006). While modern industrialized agriculture produces apparently cheap food that helps to feed growing urban populations around the world, in many countries migrant farmworkers together with small farmers and their families have suffered severe socioeconomic and environmental impacts as a result of this same capitalist agriculture (Arcury & Quandt, 1998). Such an economic model is also shaped by the ample availability and affordability of imported cheap labour, which contributes not only to increased production and profits but also reduces the need for hiring more expensive and less dependable (local) labour (Friedland, Barton, & Thomas, 1981; Thomas, 1985; Bolaria & Von Elling-Bolaria, 1997; Friedland, 2004; Binford, 2013).

In order to ensure the wellbeing of migrant and non-migrant farmworkers, International Labour Organization analysts have argued that policies and practices with respect to labour migration must be addressed within a framework of international cooperation and not only at the national level in sending or receiving countries (ILO, 2006). The inclusion of a gender lens and gender analysis in OHS frameworks is also important to better understand and address the occupational health and safety and wellbeing of all migrant and non-migrant farmworkers (ILO, 2010, 2011). Like their male counterparts, more low-income women are migrating between regions or internationally to work as farm labourers (ILO, 2010). As women, they typically face additional challenges in terms of health, safety, and personal security.

2.3. Overview of the Temporary Foreign Worker Program in Canadian Agriculture

The TFWP is a broad federal program that, in the agricultural sector, branches off into two subprograms: the long-standing Canada/Mexico Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) and the Agricultural Stream (AS). In an attempt to solve domestic labour shortages, the Canadian government established the SAWP with the Commonwealth Caribbean countries in 1966 and with Mexico in 1974 (Binford, 2006, 2013). Since 1974, Mexican farmworkers that participate in the SAWP have become an important source of agricultural labour across Canada (McLaughlin, 2009), producing and harvesting various agricultural commodities such as fruits, vegetables, ornamental plants, shrubs and trees, and honey (Basok, 2000; Ross, 2006; Preibisch & Binford, 2007). Under the SAWP, employers of seasonal labourers must offer the workers a minimum of 240 hours of paid work distributed over six weeks or less (Preibisch, 2012; ESDC, 2015a). Under this employment condition, farmworkers would have to be offered, at minimum, the equivalent of five, eight-hour work days per week for a total of 240 hours over six weeks (or less). However, the work does not have to be spread over the week in any particular way and “offered” is perhaps misleading in a couple of respects: workers may feel that they have little leeway to refuse any work that is offered given that they are anxious for income and that they well understand the expectations and needs of their employers.

While a regular workday typically includes eight hours of paid employment (under the contract), it is important to note that the SAWP contract does not impose minimum-hours per week

conditions on employers outside the six-week window. SAWP workers are allowed to work in Canada for up to eight months (per year) between January 1 and December 15 (Preibisch, 2012; ESDC, 2015a).

Under the SAWP, farmworkers can be transferred to other farms (ESDC, 2015a). However, the workers remain employed under the name of initial employer. To transfer farmworkers, employers must request the workers' consent and the written permission of the Mexican and Canadian Ministries of Labour (ESDC, 2015a). Farmworkers participating in the AS program cannot be transferred to other workplaces and under both the SAWP and AS programs, farmworkers are not able to initiate a switch to other agricultural employers, nor are they allowed to work in other sectors. Given that there is no specified tenure limit for SAWP workers, some workers have been rehired to work in Canada for as many as 30 seasons or more (Preibisch, 2012).

To understand the history and evolution of the Agricultural Stream (AS), it is necessary to consider its immediate predecessors. In 2002, the federal government implemented the Low-Skill Pilot Project (LSPP) to supply temporary migrant workers to various industries such as the energy and construction sectors (Preibisch, 2012). In 2007 the LSPP was revamped with a new name, the Pilot Project for Occupations Requiring Lower Levels of Formal Training National Occupational Classification C and D (NOC C & D Pilot) (Faraday, 2012; Preibisch, 2012). The NOC C refers to workers who have completed "secondary school and some short-duration courses or training specific to the occupation; or some secondary school, with up to two years of on-the-job training, training courses or specific work experience," whereas the NOC D includes "occupations requiring short work demonstration, or on-the-job training, or no formal educational requirements" (HRSDC, 2011, p. 10). Although newly named, the previous acronym of LSPP continued to be used to refer to both programs when they became popular in 2002. Later, on April 1, 2011, the government revamped the LSPP and renamed it as the Agricultural Stream (AS) (Hennebry & McLaughlin, 2012; Preibisch, 2012; Reed et al., 2013; ESDC, 2014; McLaughlin et al., 2014).

Once a migrant farmworker has met the requirements to apply for employment in a temporary foreign worker program in Canada, Citizenship and Immigration Canada is the agency responsible for issuing the worker a work permit. Under the AS program, employers and private contractors or recruiters can hire farmworkers from any country for up to 24 months and may renew contracts for a maximum of four years (Hennebry, 2012; Preibisch, 2012; ESDC, 2013a, ESDC, 2015a). Farmworkers employed under the AS, "must leave Canada after four years of accumulated employment and are not eligible to return for another four years (the so-called 4/4 Rule)" (Preibisch, 2012, p. 89). Unlike the SAWP which focuses only on low- or unskilled farm labour, farmworkers hired under higher-skilled AS categories, (such as managerial, professional or technical), may be eligible for permanent residency if they meet the criteria of the Provincial Nominee Program and/or Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Hennebry, 2012; ESDC, 2015b).[3] In Saskatchewan, for example, the Provincial Immigrant Nominee Program welcomes applications from migrants who want to become permanent residents of Canada. If eligible, the provincial program nominates successful candidates to the federal government. The basic eligibility criteria include education, (skilled) work experience, and language proficiency (French or English).

Whether a farmworker enters Canada under the AS or the SAWP, visas are not issued for spouses, immediate family members, or any other relatives (Hennebry, 2012). Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC), formerly known as Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), is responsible for operation of the SAWP in conjunction with Citizenship and Immigration Canada, and Service Canada (Brem, 2006; ESDC, 2015a). The SAWP is federally administered and regulated by both the Canadian and Mexican governments via a bilateral agreement (Preibisch, 2012; Binford, 2013; ESDC, 2015a). Unlike the SAWP, in the context of the AS no bilateral agreement exists. Governments allow employers to hire foreign farmworkers directly or via private recruiters and to negotiate privately the conditions of employment (Hennebry, 2012; Preibisch, 2012). Therefore, governments also do not see themselves as responsible for enforcing the terms of such contracts (Hennebry, 2012). Nevertheless, ESDC has provided a model contract as a guide for employers and contractors. Under both programs, employers must communicate to the Canadian government that they are in

[3] Though legally possible, it is not clear how often this kind of hiring happens in practice.

need of temporary foreign workers and demonstrate that it was not possible to hire Canadian workers or permanent residents despite advertising these positions (Preibisch, 2012) for a minimum of 14 calendar days (ESDC, 2015ab).

The rationale underlying the SAWP and the AS is that Canadian farmers should have the option of hiring foreign temporary/seasonal farmworkers if qualified Canadian workers or permanent residents are not available (ESDC, 2015ab). Canadian scholars have had additional things to say about the rationale underpinning TFWPs in Canadian agriculture. For example, many Canadian greenhouse operators have relied on migrant farmworkers to compete in a globalized winter vegetable sector (Preibisch, 2010, 2012). According to Preibisch (2010), in the absence of access to migrant labourers, "many producers would have lost their business to their international competitors in the United States, whose horticultural industry relies almost exclusively on undocumented Mexican workers, or to agribusiness operations in Mexico and Latin America that have access to much cheaper pools of labour and that operate in a much less regulated environment" (p. 431). Mexican migrant farmworkers have become a key human resource for Canadian farmers mostly because the poor economic prospects faced by Mexicans in their own country leads them accept low-paid jobs with demanding and, not infrequently, unpleasant and unhealthy work conditions that Canadian labourers would not accept (Bolaria, 1988; Colby, 1997; Basok, 2002, Gibb, 2006; Hennebry, 2012). Fudge and MacPhail (2009) and Hennebry (2012) argue that flexibility is a key reason for hiring Mexican SAWP farmworkers. They maintain that flexible and lean production is a goal of firms operating in competitive markets and add that a key component of flexibility is a flexible labour force—willing to accept work on any schedule, under any conditions, on any assigned tasks.

It is important to note that there is more research on Mexican than on any other Latino farmworkers in Canada. This is in part because the SAWP has been operating in Canada under a bilateral agreement with the Mexican government since 1974 whereas the AS originated in its earliest form fully 28 years later, in 2002. Comparatively little is known about Nicaraguan farmworkers working in Canada. Employment and Social Development Canada (2013b) reports that, in 2007, 110 Nicaraguan temporary migrant workers were employed in Saskatchewan (ESDC, 2013b). The same organization reports that 190 Nicaraguan workers were hired in

Saskatchewan in 2012 (ESDC, 2013b). However, the aforementioned numbers include Nicaraguan workers employed in various economic sectors (in addition to agriculture). Nicaraguan migrant farmworkers seem to be even more invisible than their Mexican counterparts not only in their (Canadian) communities but also in published scientific research.

With respect to worker health, migrant and domestic/local farmworkers are legally covered by occupational health and safety standards in Saskatchewan since they apply to all workplaces, including farms (Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety, 2007). In Saskatchewan, all migrant farmworkers (Latino and non-Latino) are also covered by basic provincial healthcare services and provided with healthcare service cards. The Government of Saskatchewan (2015) states that even if migrant farmworkers are not permanent residents or Canadian citizens, they are eligible for healthcare services (Ministry of Economy, website accessed on April 2, 2016). Latino migrant farmworkers participating in the SAWP and AS are also provided with private health/accident insurance by their employers (Hennebry, 2012; ESDC, 2016a, 2016b). With respect to workers' compensation insurance, neither domestic/local farmworkers nor migrant farmworkers are covered by the Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Act because this Act does not apply to the industries of farming and ranching (Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board, 2015). SAWP and AS contract terms stipulate that, when pesticides are part of the production system, Canadian employers must provide formal or at least informal workplace safety training, free personal protective equipment, and appropriate workplace/task supervision (ESDC, 2016a, 2016b).

SAWP and AS contracts mandate that employers must pay for the round-flight transportation costs of migrant farmworkers (ESDC, 2016a, 2016b). For SAWP participants, "a portion of these costs can be recovered through payroll deductions in all provinces, except in British Columbia" (ESDC, 2016a, date modified: 2016-04-05); for AS workers, "these costs must be paid up-front by the employer to ensure that they are not part of any negotiations related to the employment contract (ESDC, 2016b, date modified: 2016-04-05). According to Faraday (2012), if SAWP migrant farmworkers are repatriated before their contracts are completed due to "non-compliance, refusal to work, or any other sufficient reason," the workers may be required to pay the full cost of the repatriation (p. 40).

Under both the SAWP and AS programs, employers must provide free transportation between the on-site or off-site housing/living place to the location(s) where work is carried out (ESDC, 2016a, 2016b). Under the SAWP, workers must be provided no-cost housing (except in British Columbia where employers are allowed to partially recover housing costs through payroll deductions) (ESDC, 2016a); under the AS, employers are allowed to recoup part of the (on-site or off-site) housing costs (ESDC, 2016b). SAWP and AS contracts stipulate that migrant farmworkers must pay income tax and contribute to the Canada Pension Plan (Basok & Carasco, 2010; UFCW, 2015). Migrant farmworkers employed under the SAWP also pay into Employment Insurance (EI), and, according to the UFCW (2015), these workers "are ineligible to access general unemployment insurance benefits and have restricted access to EI benefits" (p. 2). It is important to clarify that, in the case of the SAWP program, some policies may vary by province (Hennebry, 2012).

The Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission states that "its job is to protect and promote human rights and to discourage discrimination against everyone living in Saskatchewan" (Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, 2014). With respect to protection of migrant worker human rights in Saskatchewan, the provincial human rights code "applies to migrant workers" (Armando Perla, personal communication, September 26, 2011). Of course, formal legal protection is not necessarily the same as substantive protection. To begin with, one must be aware of one's rights and be in a position where one feels it is possible to take action on that knowledge by, for example, lodging a complaint. Moreover, there are clearly some fundamental tensions between human rights legislation and the structure of programs such the SAWP, which effectively enables employers to select employees based on nationality/ethnicity and on gender.

Finally, the Mexican Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, or *La Secretaría del Trabajo y Previsión Social (STPS)*, provides free pre-departure orientation/information sessions to Mexican SAWP farmworkers (Basok et al., 2014). Such orientations provide information about employment conditions, certain aspects of workplace safety, general health, and how to maintain harmonious relations with coworkers and employers. Nicaraguan farmworkers employed under the AS are not provided with similar pre-departure support in Nicaragua.

2.4. Occupational Health and Safety Training: A General Context

2.4.1. Traditional OHS Training in Non-Agricultural Industries

To better understand the present reality of OHS training in the agricultural sector, it is important to consider as well how other sectors approach OHS education and training. The goal is not to describe the aforementioned approaches in detail but rather to look at some of the ways that leading sectors with, relatively speaking, substantial resources have approached the conceptualization and implementation of OHS. Companies active in the offshore oil industry, for example, have used a framework called the "Safety Climate Assessment Toolkit" (Cox & Cheyne, 2000). This toolkit has been used to measure and evaluate the safety "culture" of managers and workers while also considering company goals and objectives as well organizational structures and processes (Cox & Cheyne, 2000). The assessment is frequently a long-term endeavour, quite formal, and includes quantitative and qualitative evaluations that are informed by various theories of organizational culture (Cox & Cheyne, 2000).

It is also common for petrochemical plants to embrace relatively sophisticated approaches to making OHS more effective. These might include attention to organizational psychology, organizational design, organizational transparency, operational safety, safety culture and the diagnosis of the safety culture (Grote & Künzler, 2000). Other approaches include attention to job characteristics and the characteristics of employees, error management training, risk perception, formal safety management audits, motivation models, and statistical evidence (Grote & Künzler, 2000). Accident analysis and reporting is a rigorous approach undergirding OHS systems and facilitating learning from critical incidents in the rail industry, U.S. Air Force, and NASA (Hopkins, 2006). The aforementioned concepts and approaches are also widely embraced by prominent companies and are used to train chemical industry workers, air traffic controllers, and airline personnel (Grote & Künzler, 2000).

Salas and Cannon-Bowers (2001) and Salas, Tannenbaum, Kraiger, and Smith-Jentsch (2012) discuss how "training research" can be used to understand how to equip trainers to teach better and to help trainees to learn more effectively. These authors also discuss how the "science of

training" can be deployed to develop better training program design, implementation, and evaluation. This "science of training" is deeply rooted in psychology, especially cognitive psychology and industrial-organizational psychology, but it also has links to related fields such organizational theory and organizational analysis (Salas et al., 2012). The ultimate goal is to assure that learning is really taking place and in the most efficient ways possible (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Salas et al. (2012) endorse a modified training model inspired by the pioneering training transfer model put forward by Baldwin and Ford (1988). Although the training transfer model has been extensively used to train pilots, the authors claim that it can be useful for training personnel in other industries. Since its inception, the model has been reframed by various researchers. Generally it is presented as comprising three main stages that include other strategic components or tasks: 1) Before training: Needs analysis, description of participant characteristics, elimination of barriers, assuring institutional support, planning and objective setting, and identification of educational principles and content; 2) During training: Motivation and implementation; and, 3) After training: Monitoring, evaluation, feedback, and redesign (Ni & Branch, 2008; Daffron & North, 2011; Grossman & Salas, 2011; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011; Saks, Salas, & Lewis, 2014).

Grossman and Salas (2011), Salas et al. (2012), and Saks et al. (2014) highlight the importance of the role of coworkers in providing support during the learning process. They also emphasize the value of learning from errors during practice sessions and the importance of providing follow-up to the training process. Baldwin & Ford (1988) claim that good supervision plays a key role in the training transfer process. They argue that workers tend to see their supervisors as models. Consequently, workers try to imitate their supervisors in order to learn approved procedures and to gain their approval. Baldwin and Ford likewise emphasize the role of peer support and peer-to-peer learning. They argue that the effective transfer of training knowledge can also be supported by the institution of a "buddy system" in the workplace. A strategy that pairs up two workers (trainees) can reinforce the learning process by facilitating further exchange in ways that promote

and reinforce understanding. A buddy system can be particularly helpful when awareness of the importance of the training content starts to fade/weaken (Baldwin & Ford (1988).[4]

Among the aforementioned sophisticated training approaches, a relatively popular and practical framework for training delivery is the ADDIE framework (Ozdilek & Robeck, 2009). Such framework can be used (and adapted to) in all kinds of workplace training including OHS education and training. The acronym ADDIE stands for analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (Ozdilek & Robeck, 2009). The analysis phase entails an assessment of learner needs. Design refers to establishing goals and strategies. Development refers to the elaboration of instructional/learning materials while implementation refers to the actual delivery of training. The evaluation phase includes formative and summative assessments (Ozdilek & Robeck, 2009). The ADDIE framework can be used in a variety of learning environments and sectors. In fact, some post-secondary educational institutions have successfully used the ADDIE model for many years (Ozdilek & Robeck, 2009). With respect to agricultural settings, a modified ADDIE framework would seem to have potential applicability alongside other adult education approaches that are discussed in following sections/chapters of this dissertation.

2.4.2. Traditional OHS Training in the Agricultural Industry

Farmworker OHS preparation presents a complex set of challenges. Temporary migrant farmworkers are not the only ones reluctant to participate in OHS education/training events; employers are frequently reluctant as well. Arcury et al. (2010) report that poor acceptance of agricultural OHS preparation by employers has various roots and explanations; they assert that North American farmers have their own belief systems that prevent them from accepting OHS training for themselves, their families, and their hired workers. Training is minimal or absent for migrant farmworkers because many agricultural employers are unwilling to host training teams at their farms, even though these are the most appropriate sites for conducting training (Arcury et

[4] The Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety (2011) also promotes the "buddy system" concept. This Ministry published a guide titled "Health and Safety of Workers Orientation and Training: A Guide for Employers." The guide recommends employers identify a "reliable safety conscious worker" (p. 5) who can provide additional assistance to new and/or less experienced coworkers.

al., 2010). To complicate matters further, many US farmers tend to explain accidents as unavoidable or even predestined events, and such assumptions may prevent them from taking steps to implement effective OHS practices (Field & Tormoehlen, 2006).

Farm workplace culture and farmer psychological orientations may constitute barriers to implementation of OHS protocols and training in other ways as well (Arcury et al., 2010). Farmers in North America tend to believe that they are physically strong enough to withstand routine hazards and that there is no need to learn more about farm safety because their knowledge is already adequate thanks to living on a farm since they were young. It is also common for farmers to view farm safety narrowly as something that pertains only to tractor operation and pesticide use (Arcury et al., 2010). Farmers tend to be skeptical and leery about external interventions such as OHS training. If farm operators reject OHS training for themselves, they will be less likely to invest resources in providing workplace safety training for their hired workers (Arcury et al., 2010). On top of that, government promoted OHS programs are seen as a threat and as unwarranted interference by many farmers in North America. Many of them tend to believe that their farms are already under surveillance and heavily regulated, and that arbitrarily imposed standards put enterprise viability at risk. With respect to OHS training more specifically, they claim that they face financial constraints that make it difficult to provide OHS training to workers (Arcury & Quandt, 2009). They argue that productivity and profitability are unavoidable first priorities (Arcury et al., 2010). Of course, where farmers believe that it is necessary to balance worker OHS with business profitability—and are trading-off the former in favour of the latter—this is clearly an unfair and unacceptable shifting of burden and risk onto employees (Carson & Henenberg, 1989). It also violates basic tenets of sustainability in that economic stability and growth are being promoted at the expense of the health and safety of less powerful, more vulnerable members of the community/society.

Arcury and Quandt (2009) provide additional interesting insights for understanding North American farm culture in relation to OHS. In this regard, pesticide safety training and beliefs represent and raise particular and unique issues. Many farmers believe that, without the use of pesticides, crop production would decrease and their entire business would be at risk. Moreover, many protest that they are the ones who are most at risk of pesticide exposure because they, not

the farmworkers, are frequently in charge of handling and applying pesticides (Arcury & Quandt, 2009). For years, farmers have been taught that pesticides are safe and harmless if the indicated re-entry interval is observed, and many are quick to claim that environmentalists exaggerate pesticide-related risks (Arcury & Quandt, 2009). Pesticide use has become a highly politicized issue since the early 1960s. Farmers claim that, without pesticides, crop production is not possible but they also lack knowledge about potential environmental and health risks, and about how to handle and use pesticides in ways that reduce these risks (Arcury & Quandt, 2009).

Of course, they are not necessarily alone in this regard. Agrochemical company representatives commonly ignore the risks of pesticide exposure and may sometimes also downplay the need for pesticide safety training (Arcury et al., 2010). Farmworker beliefs as well add complexity to the scenario because their beliefs likewise can constitute barriers to learning OHS. For instance, for many Latino migrant farmworkers, being healthy or ill depends to a large degree on what God has predestined for them (Arcury et al., 2010). Such beliefs may help to explain why workers are reluctant to practice OHS protocols and to wear personal protective clothing, though such beliefs could also reflect a sense of powerlessness to change one's condition—an assessment that reflects lived experiences in the workplace and in other arenas of life. Added to this fatalism, deeply seated macho attitudes also put (male) farmworkers at risk; they like to think of themselves and to represent themselves as strong and resilient in the face of workplace hazards. Moreover, they may associate complaining about hazardous situations with being a woman or childish (Arcury & Quandt, 2009). Still others may be aware that pesticides can pose a threat to health—in the short or long term—but they avoid giving voice to such concerns for fear that it is pointless, or worse, will only put them in line for negative assessment and treatment by the employer (Arcury & Quandt, 2009).

Spitzer, Withford, & Frick (1994) and Spears et al. (2012) point out that, frequently, agricultural workers have to figure out how to access learning in their work environments because of language barriers and demanding work schedules. Some workers indicate that non-governmental organizations (e.g., growers' associations and locally active farmworker advocacy groups) provide them with pesticide safety information (Spears et al., 2012). Workers also frequently share experiences and informally exchange OHS information, though it is not clear how

accurately and completely they communicate such information to other workers (Spears et al., 2012). Additionally, many Latino migrant farmworkers lack effective reading and numeracy skills, even in Spanish, and many speak indigenous languages as their mother tongue (Arcury et al., 2010). The general picture that emerges is that Latino migrant farmworkers rely heavily upon one another to access various kinds of safety-related information, and also that they are particularly interested in learning more about pesticide safety issues and practices (Spears et al., 2012).

In Canada as in many other parts of North America, worker agricultural OHS training is frequently insufficient, inconsistent, linguistically and culturally inappropriate, and rather too informal and haphazard for the most part (Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; McLaughlin, 2009; McLaughlin, Hennebry, & Haines, 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). For example, McLaughlin (2009) reports that in Ontario, migrant worker agricultural OHS training is typically provided by farm managers or employers, sometimes in conjunction with more experienced farmworkers. Some migrant farmworkers are reached by NGOs and universities that provide farm safety training (mainly related to pesticide safety), and sometimes farms are provided with posters displaying workplace safety procedures (McLaughlin, 2009). With respect to agricultural OHS, the general pattern is one of informality and spotty coverage (see Arcury et al., 2010). This contrasts markedly with practices in other sectors where approaches such the hierarchy of control (HOC) methodology of hazard/risk reduction has been widely and regularly used (Dosman, Hagel, King, Koehncke, Kirychuk, Trask, Neudorf, Day, Voaklander, & Pickett, 2015). According to Dosman et al. (2015, p. 362), this methodology incorporates six basic procedures: 1) hazard identification, 2) risk assessment, 3) personal protective equipment use, 4) information, education, and training (also known as administrative controls), 5) engineering controls, and 6) risk elimination. Agriculture is an outlier at the low end of the scale when it comes to implementing such formal and systematic OHS assessment and risk mitigation procedures.

In the context of neoliberal globalization, worker OHS preparation is often perceived as an expensive venture that is generally problematic and difficult to implement (Loudoun & Johnstone, 2009). This is, in part, because information and knowledge are increasingly monetized and managed as commodities, and education and training related to OHS are seen as a cost and a

burden that not many business leaders are willing to take on (Loudoun & Johnstone, 2009). In almost all sectors, OHS principles and practices have been shaped by the interests of business and political elites, as well as by the neoliberal governance structures of free-trade agreements (Loundoun & Johnstone, 2009). The economic agendas of the most empowered stakeholders are advantaged while worker rights are eroded and worker wellbeing is put at risk (Loundoun & Johnstone, 2009). High unemployment rates, low rates of unionization, and high rates of fatal occupational injury are indicators of worker vulnerability and a state's inclination to create a pro-business (and anti-labour) development climate (Loomis, Schulman, Bailer, Stainback, Wheeler, Richardson, & Marshall, 2009). Brown (2002) argues that workplace OHS issues are a global threat and not just a problem of certain countries:

> The right to a safe and healthful workplace is under threat around the world as the globalized economy puts tremendous downward pressure on occupational health and safety regulations and their enforcement. "The global race to the bottom" affects developing and developed economies as transnational corporations roam the world looking for the lowest wages, the most vulnerable workforces, and the least regulation of environmental and occupational health." (Brown, 2012, p. 12, 13). "In the global economy where all parts are irrevocably linked to all others, those of us concerned about safe and healthful workplaces must work together for a world where the "race to the bottom" does not consign the vast majority of the world's people lives spent locked inside unsafe factories and adjacent poisoned communities." (Brown, 2002, p. 20, 21)

While Latino migrant farmworkers are a slightly different manifestation of the global search for sources of low-cost and flexible labour, they nevertheless experience similar downward pressure on the terms and conditions of employment—including working conditions and workplace health and safety climates. Documenting the social circumstances in which farmworkers work is important for understanding both the local and wider contexts within which the dynamics of any worker OHS initiative will unfold/operate (Spears et al., 2012). Moreover, the fact that Latino farmworkers are a dispersed and harder-to-reach population is not an excuse for not reaching them with research, education, training, and support (Spears et al., 2012).

2.5. Latino Migrant Farmworkers in Canada: Agricultural Occupational Health and Safety (OHS), Training, Language, and Culture

This section summarizes migrant farmworker OHS education and training challenges (and implications) in the context of international (farm) labour migration, especially as experienced in Canada. I particularly focus on literature dealing with Latin American farmworkers and their experiences with OHS. I have also sought out literature that deals with the OHS training, and more general training and education needs of migrant farmworkers. Canadian authors have argued that a lack of general and specific information about Canadian laws and local contexts, and lack of access to training, compounds the stresses associated with language barriers and cultural differences that are directly and indirectly an additional source of risk to the safety and wellbeing of migrant farmworkers (Preibisch, 2004; Ross, 2006; Sawchuk & Kempf, 2008; McLaughlin, 2009; Read et al., 2013; McLaughlin et al., 2014; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). In Ontario, Hennebry (2009) conducted ethnographic research to study the experiences of male Mexican workers with occupational health risks, with OHS training, and with accessing health services. She found that experiences varied across workplaces as some groups of workers were better treated than others. Based on the gaps in support that she identified, Hennebry argued that the lack of protection should be addressed even if only a minority of farmworkers manifested serious health problems.

Through ethnographic interviews conducted in Ontario, McLaughlin (2007) found that Mexican farmworkers are not only exposed to pesticides, extreme and abrupt weather changes, and musculoskeletal injuries, they also suffer from symptoms that are typical of depression. Since we know that emotions also affect judgement, the latter would appear to be a double threat to farmworker wellbeing; as a medical issue in its own right and one that may also increase the risk of accidents and other health problems. Later, McLaughlin (2009) continued her research among Mexican and Caribbean farmworkers in Ontario to learn more about access to general health information and about OHS training provided to this same population. She found that both matters warranted much more attention.

McLaughlin's research, and particularly her work on farmworker OHS education and training, provides an important starting point and inspiration for the present study. McLaughlin (2009) found that the quality of safety training varied markedly across Ontario farms. Workers reported that, at some farms, they did receive training. However, under the SAWP, workers can be employed on (or transferred to) other farms where OHS training is not necessarily part of the enterprise culture. Significantly, some workers reported that lack of OHS training was a cause of injuries suffered at these and other workplaces. Only 18% (12/66) of farmworkers interviewed reported having received OHS training (McLaughlin, 2009, p. 292). The rest (82%) said that they did not remember receiving any such training—which does not necessarily mean that they did not receive OHS training but does suggest that any such training that they did receive was likely brief and not well adapted to their learning styles (McLaughlin, 2009, p. 292). McLaughlin (2009) also found that the workers who acknowledged having received OHS training also disclosed that the training was "inconsistent" and was, on occasion, delivered by one of their coworkers. McLaughlin's research does not provide any evidence on whether or not the workers in question were in any way qualified to be OHS trainers. Among the supposedly 'trained' farmworkers, a fair number reported having completed pesticide safety training (McLaughlin, 2009, p. 293). McLaughlin observed that workers who handle pesticides had a higher chance of being provided with training than those who did not. Those who received pesticide safety training reported that the training sessions took place at an Ontario university, however, the training was delivered in English and the only (printed) material translated into Spanish was a brochure along with some brief passages in Spanish (McLaughlin, 2009).

The workers who attended training sessions at that university also reported that there was no interpreter present. While some workers said that they understood the presentations, other participants had trouble understanding. McLaughlin stressed that most of the Mexican farmworkers she interviewed were able to speak some words of English but that only a few seemed to have even basic conversational skills. Unfortunately, McLaughlin (2009) does not provide a great deal of detail about how training sessions attended by migrant farmworkers were designed or delivered. She did note that many workers showed an interest in becoming more informed with respect to OHS fundamentals. They observed and reflected on workplace safety practices and they tried to interpret the warning/hazard pictograms on containers and equipment.

Some farmworkers reported that bilingual OHS instructions were posted at the farms where they worked (McLaughlin, 2009). However, McLaughlin argues that the provision of bilingual written OHS information does not guarantee full understanding due to various literacy issues among the workers.[5] McLaughlin (2009) recommends that OHS training should include a mix of delivery modalities that address the various learning capacities and needs of workers.

With respect to personal protective equipment (PPE), McLaughlin (2009, p. 296) found that 50% of her Mexican interviewees that handle pesticides reported that they were not provided with such equipment. The three most frequently provided PPE items were gloves, masks, and raincoats. Boots and goggles were less commonly provided. The author found that some farmers were well informed about the importance of PPE use, particularly when dealing with pesticides. McLaughlin also found evidence that there are migrant farmworkers who are relatively well equipped with PPE and training—or at least perceived themselves to be. While such training was frequently provided by government employees, employers, and/or farmworker advocates, many workers also made efforts to learn by themselves (McLaughlin, 2009, p. 300). Be that as it may, although most workers understood that such chemicals may be dangerous, few workers demonstrated possession of accurate knowledge of pesticide classes and exposure types (McLaughlin, 2009). Despite some positive findings, McLaughlin concludes that, "there is a long way to go to ensure consistent provision of training and PPE across farms. To this end it is extremely important to assess workers' own understandings of pesticides, risks, and protection" (2006, p. 297). It should also be recognized that some migrant farmworkers employed on Ontario farms do not use PPE because of uncomfortable designs, high temperatures that may lead to discomfort and even heatstroke, and because of the costs of acquiring PPE at farms where such equipment is not routinely provided (McLaughlin, 2009)[6].

[5] Of course, it is not guaranteed that even workers with fluent English will fully understand such instructions and warnings given the brevity and uneven quality of the writing, and given the many nuances of the messaging.

[6] During my visits to Saskatchewan farms where migrant farmworkers were employed, I noticed that some Canadian/local farmworkers were not wearing their personal protective gear either. It is important to note that under Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety regulations it is seen as a responsibility of workers to wear/use personal protective gear and equipment that is provided (see Appendix H).

Cultural and educational factors also play an important role in explaining less frequent use of PPE by some farmworkers. For example, McLaughlin (2009, p. 299) argues that, among many Latino farmworkers, the cultural trait of “machismo” (self-perception as being, or needing to appear, virile and strong) prevents them from fully embracing OHS practices. Some agriculture workers perceive themselves as strong enough to deal with and withstand workplace hazards without the aid of PPE (McLaughlin, 2009). To complicate matters further, some workers avoid complaining about hazards or problems associated with PPE use because they fear being perceived as a weak or ‘problematic’ worker—which might put renewal of their contracts at risk.

Many farmworkers lack a preventive OHS culture in part because, in their countries of origin, pesticide use policies and related OHS regulations are “lax” (McLaughlin, 2009, p. 303). In more recent research, McLaughlin et al. (2014) confirmed that many farmworkers in Ontario still lacked pesticide training and that the character of training that was available varied markedly across farms in terms of levels of informality, frequency, and depth. Although the quality and frequency of OHS training is uneven, McLaughlin reported that some aspects of OHS have been improving—albeit “with too many workers falling between the cracks” (2009, p. 303). Despite some improvements, migrant farmworkers in Ontario still experience a number of vulnerabilities. For instance, a number of farmworkers receive training that includes printed information and audio-visual materials such as videos (McLaughlin et al., 2014). However, such materials were reported to be less effective because, in many instances, they were provided only in English (McLaughlin et al., 2014). On top of that, limited formal education prevents most workers from fully understanding warning labels or OHS technicalities related to pesticide application, for example (McLaughlin et al., 2014). As a more fundamental and systematic response, McLaughlin suggests that alternative agroecological forms of agricultural production, such as organic agriculture, might contribute to improving the OHS of all involved given that no synthetic agrochemicals are used (McLaughlin, 2009).

In Southern Ontario, Narushima and Sanchez (2014) studied issues related to OHS training of Mexican and Jamaican migrant farmworkers. They interviewed nine farmer-employers (five female and four male) who had been hiring workers through the SAWP for between 20 and 40 years. Five of the employers employed only Mexican farmworkers, three only Caribbean

workers, and one had hired from both sources. Although the authors did not interview farmworkers, they addressed an important gap in agricultural guest worker program research in Canada. Interviews with farmer-employers are not frequently conducted. The authors of this study emphasize that every employer has her/his own particular background and that each workplace has specific characteristics. Perspectives and practices with respect to OHS may therefore be expected to vary. Narushima and Sanchez (2014) reported that the employers included in their sample provided training to their farmworkers in various modalities that ranged from the provision of orientation sessions and general introductory information, to provision of safety training materials and equipment, to the involvement of external non-profit safety training organizations that also provide language interpretation. Narushima and Sanchez also reported that one of the employers in their study seemed particularly conscious of the importance of preparing workers with OHS fundamentals, saying that employers are responsible for providing the necessary supports that ensure worker OHS. Six (6/9) employers reported that "training for migrant farmworkers was done on-the-job by 'certified' personnel (including the employers themselves) if necessary" (2014, p. 7). As related by the employers, the most common hazards faced by migrant farmworkers are exposures and injuries related to pesticide and machinery use, and musculoskeletal injuries related to lifting and other activities (Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). To some degree at least, all the employers seemed aware of the importance of OHS for the wellbeing of their employees and their enterprise.

As these employers also reported, financial and human resources are key determinants of OHS training provision at the workplace. Three (3/9) employers "explicitly expressed their frustrations about the increasing burden on employers' shoulders for safety training without sufficient support either from the government or certain farmers' associations" (Narushima & Sanchez, 2014, p. 7). One of the interviewed employers complained about the costs associated with worker OHS training because it is provided during work hours. They do not have personnel qualified to provide such training nor the financial means to cover such costs. However, the employers reported that they tried their best to provide OHS training to workers.

In sum, most of these employers argued that promoting the health of the workers was an important challenge (Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). They argued that workers are more interested

in obtaining additional hours of work than in participating in (unpaid) educational initiatives (Narushima & Sanchez, 2014). Based on this scenario, the provision of OHS education and training seems likely to be given short shrift because many farmworkers and employers are concerned with financial and productivity issues and not very favourably disposed to investing time or money in OHS preparation. Narushima and Sanchez (2014) also report that several of the employers interviewed for their study acknowledged an ongoing need to more adequately address clashes between local Canadian and farmworker cultures.

Drawing on critical race theory, feminist, and political economy theory, Lowe (2007) did field research in the Saint-Rémi area of Quebec. Interviews were conducted with two Guatemalan farmworkers employed under the former "pilot Foreign Worker Program" and with five Mexicans employed under the SAWP. All the interviewees were men working in lettuce production. The most commonly reported accidents among Guatemalan and Mexican workers were related to pesticide use and machinery. Many such accidents seemed to be linked to lack of training and to language barriers (the local working language being French in this case). The other major risk factor was "extremely long work hours" (Lowe, 2007, p. 34). Lowe observed that, compared to the Mexicans, Guatemalan farmworkers were poorer, less educated, and faced more significant language barriers. She appears to suggest that, compared to Mexican migrant workers employed under the SAWP, Guatemalan farmworkers employed under the pilot Foreign Worker Program experienced even lower levels of support. Furthermore, she argues that "in the case of Quebec, by creating a new migrant farmworker recruitment program and maintaining the old one (SAWP), employers and the Canadian state are able to maximize productivity by pitting vulnerable working groups against one another, thereby maximizing profits" (Lowe, 2007, p. 47). While Lowe's sample was quite small, these interviewees nevertheless revealed some variability in employment conditions and work experiences. While in the field, Lowe received some support from the United Food and Commercial Workers in Saint-Rémi, Quebec, and was provided with a place to meet with the farmworkers.

Valarezo (2007) also conducted interviews with Guatemalan and Mexican migrant farmworkers in the Saint-Rémi area. Although farmworkers in Quebec are covered by provincial OHS standards and provincial health services, Valarezo claims that long distances separating farms and

urban areas have negative implications for (migrant and non-migrant or domestic) worker access to health services and contribute to making farmworkers socially invisible (Valarezo, 2007).

Otero and Preibisch (2010) and Preibisch and Otero (2014) report on mixed methods research conducted with SAWP stakeholders in British Columbia. They surveyed 100 Mexican migrants and 100 South Asian farmworkers who were Canadian citizens or had permanent resident status. The Mexicans were interviewed in Spanish and the South Asians in Punjabi and English. Fully 74 percent of the Mexican interviewees and 70 percent of the non-Mexican respondents reported that no OHS training or information was provided "at their principal worksite" (Preibisch & Otero, 2014, p. 190). Some of the workers worked on more than one farm and the authors reported that language barriers frequently led to problems with understanding instructions given by crew leaders (Otero & Preibisch, 2010; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). Although the South Asian farmworkers who were interviewed held Canadian citizenship or had permanent resident status, their English language skills tended to be limited. The authors reported that 75% of the South Asian farmworkers "who reported work-related injuries rated their English proficiency as poor to very poor," and that a similar trend was found among the Mexican farmworkers (Preibisch & Otero, 2014, p. 190-191). Though some workers reported having received OHS training, the authors point out that learning OHS fundamentals from coworkers and through personal experiences is common. Based on their analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, they concluded as follows:

> Even when workers did receive some occupational health and safety training, our research did not find a significant association between training and a decreased likelihood of occupational injury: workers were just as likely to get injured whether they received training or not. This could indicate that training is inadequate, corroborating our qualitative findings. Moreover, that training did not affect the likelihood of injury could also indicate that a trained person who returns to a hazard-filled environment is still exposed to the potential for injury because the structural factors that lead people to work unsafely or accept unsafe work remain unaddressed.[…] Workers whose self-assessed English is poor or very poor were more likely to have sustained a work related injury. Although the survey did not find statistically significant results for Mexican migrants, it is noteworthy that 82 percent of those who reported a work-related injury also reported poor or very poor English skills. Mexican migrants perceived language barriers as a greater risk than South Asian immigrants, some of whom speak English or whose contractor, supervisor, or employer speaks Punjabi (Preibisch & Otero, 2014, p. 190-191).

The above passage suggests that workplace characteristics and workplace politics are important factors in OHS outcomes. Furthermore, training especially when it is provided in what is for the workers, a foreign language may not be sufficient to prevent injuries. Finally, it also highlights the significant roles that language barriers can play with respect to farmworker OHS. While recognizing the importance of structural and workplace factors, the authors point out that language barriers exacerbate the likelihood of injury and argue that interpreters are urgently needed to face these communication challenges (Preibisch & Otero, 2014).

Preibisch and Otero (2014) point out that South Asian farmworkers have the opportunity to attend English classes funded by the State because of their legal status. Citizenship rights and English classes help to reduce worker vulnerabilities and increase their opportunities to better their conditions of employment—for example, accessing work schedules that are somewhat more convenient and salubrious than the schedules imposed on Mexican farmworkers (Preibisch & Otero, 2014). While citizenship or permanent residency does not guarantee avoidance of vulnerabilities, Preibisch and Otero recommend that governments should address language barriers and develop new immigration schemes for so-called "unskilled" migrant farmworkers. In doing so, Preibisch and Otero (2014) also argue for a program that recognizes the diverse skills that these supposedly unskilled workers do possess. Lower levels of English-language proficiency may lead to less favourable treatment by managers. According to some researchers, Caribbean farmworkers in Ontario tended to receive better treatment than Mexican farmworkers because the Jamaicans communicate relatively well in English, whereas the majority of Mexicans do not speak English (Encalada, 2006; McLaughlin, 2009). In addition to impacts on workplace relations and workplace communications, language barriers can contribute to farmworker isolation and social exclusion (Preibisch, 2004). This risk has been documented in several provinces.

Josephine Smart (1997) interviewed ten Mexican men employed under the SAWP in greenhouses located in or near to five Alberta towns. She noted that their only chance to socialize and learn more about their new living environment occurred when they went to the nearest town to shop. Such shopping expeditions represented the sole opportunity to meet Canadians other than their employers. Smart comments that, when she and the other interviewers initially approached

Mexican farmworkers in the supermarket, the workers reacted "with a great deal of suspicion and fear" (p. 151). She reported that the workers said that they wanted to learn English not only to better understand employers but also to be able to communicate more effectively with bank personnel and supermarket clerks, and to be able to interact more with local people. The Mexican farmworkers who had previously worked in Southern Ontario reported that they preferred to go back to Ontario because of the higher wages paid in that province and because they would have a better chance of avoiding the isolation that they experienced in Alberta. There were more chances to interact with locals and to meet other Mexicans in Ontario. With regards to research modalities, Smart (1997) suggests that participatory research would be a useful approach as it would give more voice to the workers and possibly lead more assuredly to addressing their priorities. As with as Lowe's study, Smart had only a small sample of farmworker respondents that would not have revealed the full range of migrant experiences in Alberta. Nevertheless, her study revealed some important issues in terms of isolation and language barriers.

Research focusing on SAWP farmworkers has also been conducted in rural Nova Scotia. Here as well, language barriers and geographical and social isolation have been reported—the latter exacerbated by a lack of public transportation. In Mexico, Horgan and Liinamaa (2012) conducted interviews with six individuals who had previously been employed in the Annapolis Valley of Nova Scotia under the SAWP. Given various difficulties reaching such workers, they resorted to a combination of purposive and snowball sampling. The authors noted that, while their small sample (n=6) cannot claim to be fully representative, there is some consistency with findings from other studies involving former or current migrant farmworkers employed in the same study area (Horgan & Liinamaa, 2012, p. 17). Based on their own interviews, these researchers concluded that communication issues play a significant role in workplace safety. Communications barriers also contribute to misunderstandings and to social isolation, both of which can generate tensions, stress, and frustration. It is therefore important that migrant farmworkers be provided with viable opportunities to learn English (Horgan & Liinamaa, 2012).

In Manitoba, Read, Zell and Fernandez (2013) conducted ethnographic interviews with eight Mexican farmworkers employed in the SAWP and two worker advocates. Based on this fieldwork, they argue that the health of farmworkers is at risk if they are not provided with

culturally and linguistically appropriate OHS education and training. The authors suggest that OHS preparation is particularly necessary when new or unfamiliar machinery arrives at the workplace. Lacking sufficient OHS preparation and English language proficiency, migrant workers depend on the knowledge of more experienced coworkers and also draw on their personal experiences in Mexico (Read et al., 2013). Long hours of work and a lack of public transportation are important impediments to accessing language and OHS training that must be addressed. The farms where SAWP workers are employed are often far away from urban centers and workers therefore frequently depend on an employer's vehicle and schedule to access training. Distance, time pressures, and lack of transportation likewise decrease opportunities and possibilities for networking with other Latinos and with Canadians. Significantly, this situation may also prevent workers from accessing health services in a timely manner (Read et al., 2013). Read et al. reported that all the migrant workers they interviewed evinced or demonstrated an interest in learning English, and two of them asked the researchers for guidance on purchasing Spanish-English dictionaries.

While recognizing that information gleaned from interviews with only eight farmworkers cannot be generalized reliably to the whole population of migrants, they nevertheless argue that such interviews "provide understanding about their experiences and perspectives" (pp. 11-12). The first concern of Mexican farmworkers is getting more hours of work because they desire to maximize their income while in Canada (Read et al., 2013). However, this does not mean that they are inured to all hardships and disinterested in learning English. Read et al. observe that migrant farmworkers in Manitoba have a legal right to organize and that unions could potentially help farmworkers to access English language instruction as well as relevant and adapted OHS training. In concert with the findings of other studies reviewed in this chapter, some of these Mexican farmworkers working in Manitoba reported that they would prefer to work in Ontario because there are more opportunities for interacting with other Latinos and for accessing organizations that offer English language training (Read et al., 2013).

In Saskatchewan, Poirier (2010) used purposeful and snowball sampling to locate and interview 14 beekeepers who have employed farmworkers from Mexico, Nicaragua, the Philippines, and Romania. Poirier (2010) claims, that Saskatchewan apiarists need migrant farmworkers to remain

competitive and to ensure the economic sustainability of their enterprises. She also reports that the apiarist that were interviewed prefer to hire foreign migrant farmworkers because domestic workers show less commitment to their jobs. It is uncertain whether they will show up the next day to work. Moreover, it is difficult to replace them. Such difficulties are aggravated towards the end of the production season. By the time a new hire is recruited, and he or she is trained, the season is about to end. In such a situation, some apiarists may be inclined to skimp on the training of new workers (Poirier, 2010, p. 54). Employers prefer to train workers that demonstrate long-term commitment as well as aptitude—and may take steps to increase this kind of loyalty among their migrant employees as well (Poirier, 2010).

> Participants [apiarists] believed it important to treat workers well. If workers are treated fairly they are more likely to return year after year, ensuring retention. Retention is important to producers in that they have fewer struggles each year in having to overcome language barriers, there is less need to continually train workers and a trusting relationship is developed between employer and employee. (Poirier, 2010, p. 57, 60).

Although Poirier's study helps to explain why many Saskatchewan apiarists hire Latino or other foreign farmworkers, she did not find it possible to interview such workers directly. Consequently, her study provides no information about worker (migrant or non-migrant) perspectives on OHS training, nor on their experiences and views with respect to language barriers or difficulties related to cultural differences. In terms of the information needs of migrant workers employed in the apiary sector, Poirier (2010) recommends that new policies "in which the workers must be provided with some orientation materials and information in their native language" (p. 68) should be implemented so that they are aware of and understand the context of their employment. Poirier stresses that a number of the apiarists that she interviewed hire foreign migrant farmworkers who have relevant work experience and beekeeping skills; however, the employers noted that even these migrant agriculture workers need training in the Canadian context in order to adapt to their new work environments (Poirier, 2010).

Table 1.1 shows how Saskatchewan compares with other provinces and Canada as a whole in terms of the numbers of temporary foreign and migrant farmworkers who were hired under the AS and SAWP programs. The number of temporary foreign/migrant workers hired for

agricultural jobs in all three prairie provinces is very small compared to the three provinces with the highest reported numbers of temporary foreign farmworkers—Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec. While the number of international migrant workers employed in Saskatchewan agriculture has grown in recent years, given their relatively small number, migrant farmworkers employed in the province tend to risk experiencing isolation and invisibility. This is compounded by the fact that agriculture in Saskatchewan is spread out over a vast area, rural areas tend to be sparsely populated, the enterprises hiring these temporary foreign workers tend to be at some distance from each other, public transportation options are few, and the enterprises involved sometimes hire only a small number of foreign workers.

Table 1.1. Temporary foreign workers hired under agricultural occupations in 2012, by program

	Canada	ON	BC	QC	AB	MB	SK
SAWP	29,025	18,500	4,980	2,445	1,060	295	200
AS	7,680	1,340	880	4,195	820	165	220

Source: Employment and Social Development Canada, 2014 (modified).

In 2014 in Saskatchewan, 185 migrant farmworkers were employed under the SAWP, and 218 under the AS program (ESDC, 2016c). At the national level in Canada, a total of 36,721 migrant farmworkers were employed under the SAWP, and 8,108 under the AS in 2014 (ESDC, 2016c).

A number of proposals have been made about how to address the challenges of migrant farmworker OHS learning in Canada. For example, Hennebry (2009, 2012), and Otero and Preibisch (2010) suggest that governments should implement outreach initiatives that include instruction in a language that migrant farmworkers understand. Alternatively, arrangements should be made to put in place a bilingual liaison person who can assist employers and farmworkers with translation and interpretation at the worksite (Kealey, Protheroe, MacDonald, & Vulpe, 2006). Spears et al. (2012) maintain that it is important to explore the possibility of training experienced farmworkers who have been identified as more ready to learn and act as "*in situ*" OHS liaisons or OHS "*Promotores*" (literally promoters) who can also collaborate effectively with external OHS specialists, medical personnel, employers, and/or researchers (Spears et al., 2012, p. 419).

Undoubtedly, the realities discussed above are complex. They also have been largely ignored by many stakeholders. Where difficulties and risks have been acknowledged, this has typically not led to concerted action. Perhaps this relates to the historical characteristics of these agricultural labour markets and to the prevailing conditions of employment. Perhaps it is also connected to the fact that the workers in question are foreigners who lack political influence and commonly cannot speak English. However, it is important to critically and effectively engage with these issues if we are serious about striving for an agriculture that is more sustainable in all the major dimensions of that concept—and for all the people who are deeply implicated as direct participants.

2.6. Migrant Farmworkers, Alternative OHS Training Approaches, and Intercultural Communication

2.6.1. Migrant Farmworkers and Alternative OHS Training Approaches

Latino farmworkers confront multiple educational, training, linguistic, and cultural barriers when they come to Canada or the USA to work. To ascertain the most urgent training needs related to agricultural OHS, and to explore how such training can best be adapted to particular cultural and agricultural contexts, some scholars suggest instituting a participatory needs assessment. A participatory approach can also be useful for evaluating training programs and educational materials (Isaacs & Bean, 1995; Velázquez, 1996; Arcury et al., 2010). In general, to improve agricultural OHS education and training for farmworkers, it may also be useful to conduct exploratory research that takes account worker ethnicity, literacy levels, and sociocultural backgrounds (Arcury & Quandt, 2003; McCauley, Shapiro, Scherer, & Lasarev, 2004). In conjunction with enhanced safety legislation and regulation, a deeper understanding of literacy issues and sociocultural particularities may help stakeholders to identify and develop suitable content and techniques for agricultural OHS training programs. Whatever the combination of information and pedagogical practices, it may be necessary to offer some training at agricultural worksites or in other locations that are readily accessible to workers (McCauley et al., 2004; Field & Tormoehlen, 2006; Snipes, Thompson, O'Connor, Shell-Duncan, King, & Herrera, 2009; Arcury et al., 2010; Barnetson, 2012).

Many Latino migrant farmworkers lack the communication and literacy skills (in any language) that are required to learn effectively from conventional agricultural OHS training programs (Arcury et al., 2010). To effectively transfer knowledge in a multicultural environment, communicators need to listen to workers, value the knowledge that workers possess, and build relationships of trust and mutual appreciation (Kayes & Yamazaki, 2005). They also need the ability to translate complex concepts into language that can be readily assimilated by people with quite different life experiences and worldviews (Kayes & Yamazaki, 2005). The effort involved should not be minimized but the potential payoffs for providing culturally adapted and effective OHS training include "reduced insurance costs for employers, improved incomes for workers, and lower health care costs for everyone" (Arcury et al., 2010, p. 10). To this must be added, better mental and physical health for workers, improved working relations, and agricultural workplaces and production systems that can better meet robust, multidimensional definitions of sustainable.

Such multidimensional definitions include, of course, the idea that stakeholder economic interests (migrant workers included) do not jeopardize the individual and collective social wellbeing of all those involved in agriculture (Foladori, 2006; Bitsch, 2010). Although the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development are contested and no consensus exists on a singular definition, I considered it important to present a working definition of sustainability as a starting point for further discussion. The National Academy of Sciences (2010) states that "sustainability has been described as the ability to provide for core societal needs in a manner that can be readily continued into the indefinite future without unwanted negative effects" (p. 23). Sustainability in agriculture includes ensuring the wellbeing of farmers, farmworkers, local communities, food consumers, and society at large, and thus is not only about taking care of the environment and assuring the economic viability of the enterprises involved (NAS, 2010). While this "definition" has strengths, it may need some refinement to include other important factors and dimensions. It can be argued, for example, that "sustainability" should also include attention to honouring and advancing the sociocultural and political characteristics and interests of stakeholders such as their democratic and civil rights, inter-group and intragroup equity, and their cosmovision and spirituality (Feenstra, 2002).

Vogel (2003) and Bitsch (2010) note that the lack of consensus as to what social sustainability in agriculture entails is a conceptual challenge among stakeholders and international agencies. Bitsch proposes that social sustainability in agriculture is a process of promoting social justice, labour rights, decent treatment of all farmworkers, and overall community development. The community level is key to conceptualizing and promoting sustainability. Provided that they do not impinge on the rights of others, each group of people and each community should have the freedom to define and refine sustainability goals according to their own realities and needs (Barkin, 2000).

Especially given the socioeconomic impacts of neoliberal globalization, labourers and labour issues should be integrated into agricultural sustainability indicators (Bitsch, 2010; Szell, 2014). Of course, the agricultural production systems must also aim to preserve natural resources and to minimize pollution caused by the indiscriminate use of synthetic and toxic agrochemicals (NAS, 2010). The health of workers is an important aspect of environmental health and the World Health Organization (1995) reports that investing in OHS also increases productivity, promotes social development, and generates economic growth. Robust OHS standards and practices are consistent with a vision of sustainability that involves simultaneously addressing economic prosperity, social wellbeing and equity, and environmental protection. It is central and essential to any conception of sustainable development that calls for addressing multidimensional stakeholder interests in ways that concurrently promote synergies and (economic, social, and environmental) multipliers while avoiding untenable trade-offs and injustices (WCED, 1988; Gertler, 2006; IISD, 2010).

With respect to the future of worker training, some scholars and advanced practitioners would argue that it is necessary to reconceptualise the endeavour, to move beyond a focus on the provision of appropriately packaged information towards a more transformative educational process that helps learners to make meaningful changes in their personal and working lives (Freire, 2000; Jackson, 2007). The adult education approaches of Freire (and those inspired by his teachings) hold considerable promise in this regard. Freire developed and refined his educational philosophy and techniques in Latin America. His broadly focused approach to literacy and consciousness-raising is widely used to address the education needs of marginalized

people. According to Freire, educators should encourage learners to be critical thinkers and creative learners. He argues that, in order to design and deliver effective educational programs, workers' worldviews and social realities have to be taken into account (Freire, 2000; Jackson, 2007). Other researchers and educators have suggested that one also needs to understand workplace power relations and the politics of OHS legislation in order to design and implement effective OHS education and training programs (Elkind, 2007; Flocks et al., 2013; Anderson & Lundqvist, 2014).

As argued by Preibisch and Otero (2014) above, Colligan and Cohen (2004) and Barnetson (2012) maintain that provision of OHS education and training alone is not likely to be sufficient to prevent workplace injuries. Barnetson suggests that OHS training must be accompanied by the enforcement of OHS legislation and by regular and systematic government oversight. According to Barnetson (2012) "there is no evidence that education is more effective than legislation at reducing injuries and weak support that educational programs reduce occupational injuries, with no evidence of this in agriculture" (Barnetson, 2012, p. 146). Moreover, although adequate OHS legislation is crucial, Barnetson argues that legislation alone is not sufficient because compliance is not assured. For Barnetson, a combination of effective education, robust OHS legislation, employer commitment, and vigilant enforcement will be necessary to ensure the wellbeing of farmworkers and their employers.

2.6.2. Migrant Farmworker OHS and Intercultural Communication

To better understand the intercultural dimensions of communications between migrant farmworkers and their employers, it is necessary to consider possible approaches to conceptualizing culture. It is acknowledged that there are different concepts of culture and that each concept has been crafted according to the perceptions and preoccupations that predominate in a given academic discipline or school of thought. In ethnography—a subdiscipline and fieldwork methodology rooted in applied anthropology—it is apparent that the scope of the concept of culture can be narrowed down or expanded according to the researcher's goals (Creswell, 2013). The concept of culture can also be adjusted when specific issues or aspects present within a given cultural group or milieu are the focus of research (Creswell, 2013).

However, regardless of how much the concept is adjusted, it can be argued that culture should always include participants' cosmovisions, perceptions, and understandings of their world. In other words, it is crucial to study how people make sense of themselves, others, and the circumstances that shape their realities and experiences.

In general, in this study, culture is taken to denote a set of patterned behaviours, preferences, and practices that a group of people collectively shares through their day-to-day living (Trajkovski & Loosemore 2006). Over generations, groups of people co-generate and share all kinds of learnings, experiences, information, knowledge, traditions, habits, practices, beliefs, and ways of thinking and perceiving realities that confront them (Neuliep, 2006; Trajkovski & Loosemore 2006). Communication is an essential component of culture. Communication can be conceptualized as a process of exchanging messages between senders (encoders) and receivers (decoders). Messages encode thoughts and feelings using symbols, verbalized and written words, quantity of words, intensity of feelings, and intentions (Neuliep, 2006). Dima argues that the process of communication "is never perfect" because messages are always dependent on the interpretation of those people exchanging on both ends of a given message (Dima, 1990, p. 29). If communication takes place between people that do not share the same culture and language, the risk of misinterpreting messages is higher (Johnson, 2004). Even if two groups of people from different cultures share the same language, misunderstandings may arise (Johnson, 2004).

Sharing the same culture and language increases the chances of establishing a more reliable channel of communication and minimizing conflicts stemming from misunderstandings (Neuliep, 2006). Bakic-Miric (2012) argues that communication implies assigning meaning to messages. Ideally, the meaning that a message receiver assigns to the message should be as close as possible to the meaning that was originally intended and encoded by the message sender (Bakic-Miric, 2012). Of course, it does not help that messages in any language may be ambiguous to start with, carrying multiple meanings only some of which are acknowledged, foregrounded, and made explicit (Dima, 1990).

When communication takes place between people that do not share the same culture and language, it is more likely that it will be subject to interpretations that may be erroneous and

cause (further) misunderstandings (Bakic-Miric, 2012). To complicate matters, different accents, pronunciation, sets of gestures, and body language are factors that may complicate or contribute to communication effectiveness (Bakic-Miric, 2012). Of course, nonverbal communication often enhances communication, including between those who speak different languages and come from different cultures. Intercultural communication can be seen as communication attempted between people hailing from different cultures (Neuliep, 2006). Generally, language can be thought of as a code of spoken and written messages that shapes people's thinking (Bakic-Miric, 2012). Language is a medium that people from the same or different cultures use to communicate and to develop interpersonal understandings (Bakic-Miric, 2012). However, we should also be aware that additional differences may complicate the challenges of communication between—or even within—language communities. Social class, ethnicity, gender, age, and many other diverse life experiences affect language use and how speech is interpreted. Dima argues that language is specific to each (sub)culture and its communication processes. It follows that 'Spanish' is not always 'just Spanish' and Canadian farmer English certainly is not Nicaraguan peasant farmer Spanish. Many problems can arise and get aggravated when people do not share the same culture and language (Dima, 1990). This is the complex 'language' challenge that potentially confronts many migrant farmworkers (and their Canadian employers).

In the context of temporary foreign worker programs in Canadian agriculture, language barriers have the potential to put at risk the overall wellbeing of migrant temporary farmworkers. Language barriers may put other workplace participants at risk as well. Dima (1990) argues that when people are not fluent in the same language, when they do not share a language in common, it becomes much more difficult to communicate complex or nuanced concerns, needs, or desires. Communication is generally most efficient when transmitter and receiver share the same culture and language (Dima, 1990), and, one could add as well, when they share life circumstances, worldviews, and goals.

Drawing on de Luna Villalón (2011) and considering the many complicating factors involved with temporary foreign worker programs in Canada, language barriers can also be understood as factors that hinder the effectiveness of communication, and that may promote and augment social inequalities. Given their structurally disadvantaged situation, and given that they are the ones that

have traveled to a relatively unknown place where culture, communication practices, and language are all different, it is migrant farmworkers who disproportionately bear the risks and experience the negative consequences. Language barriers become important social barriers in the daily lives of these workers (de Luna Villalón, 2011). With that said, it can be inferred that language barriers can and do exacerbate the health and safety vulnerabilities of migrant temporary farmworkers. Language barriers may also increase any sense of social isolation and/or alienation, which are likewise a source of health risks. In sum, language barriers and related communications issues are an omnipresent challenge and potentially major problem for foreign farmworkers and their employers.

2.7. Chapter Summary

This literature review has focused primarily on the challenges that various stakeholders face when it comes to providing OHS education and training for migrant farmworkers in Canada. The major challenges that emerged in the literature review were communication and language barriers, literacy issues, cultural predispositions of workers and employers, transportation and access issues, regulatory and enforcement gaps, lack of adapted training programs, and certain structural conditions of employment such as insecurity of job tenure and hourly-based contracts. Agricultural workplaces and labour regimes frequently privilege productivity over education and training.

Other social conditions were shown to be challenging as well. For example, researchers in various provinces revealed that migrant farmworkers remain a vulnerable group of people mainly because of policies that limit their ability to move between employers, limit them to temporary stays in Canada, and limit their access to permanent residency. Along the same lines, the renewal or termination of work contracts depends largely on employer recommendations, and workers are cautious because they do not possess the necessary power to challenge a decision that may put their contracts at risk. The social/structural conditions discussed here encourage migrant farmworkers to focus their attention and efforts on securing sufficient hours of work to meet their financial goals. Combined with irregular schedules, this concern leaves many workers with limited time or energy for educational and training activities/initiatives. Furthermore, the

academic literature raises the possibility that communication barriers, especially when compounded by (inter)cultural factors, can increase and exacerbate health and safety risks. Many scholars conclude that there is a need for linguistically and culturally appropriate OHS training for migrant farmworkers. Some also argue that there is a need for well-trained and bilingual liaison personnel/officers who can regularly visit farms where migrant farmworkers are employed.

Alternative approaches to meeting migrant farmworker OHS education and training needs are evidently necessary and intercultural communication theories provide a framework for better understanding the multidimensional challenges involved. Interestingly, not many Canadian researchers have attempted to survey employers with respect to their perspectives on challenges and opportunities related to worker OHS preparation. The present study attempts to respond to this gap by interviewing both farmworkers and their employers. Furthermore, connections between farmworker OHS preparation and agricultural sustainability have not been systematically examined. In the following chapter, I will further develop some lines of argument highlighting the central place of farmworker health and safety in any meaningful consideration of the social/human dimensions of agricultural sustainability.

Ethnography was the principal methodological approach used in many of the studies reviewed here. Ethnography featuring face-to-face interviews and field observation can help us to construct a nuanced understanding of stakeholder experiences and perspectives. While attentive to the micro-politics of workplaces and educational initiatives, many of the researchers reviewed here also employ a political economy perspective that links individual and group experiences to broader economic and political developments—neoliberal globalization and new forms of labour market regulation, for example. In the next chapter, I describe the theoretical and methodological features of critical ethnography, an approach that integrates ethnographic field research with the sensibilities of political economy to the centrality of public policies and to the importance of power relations and structural inequalities—including those associated with nationality, citizenship status, class, race, gender, and education. The theoretical discussion also directs attention to the core intellectual foundations of the discipline of adult education and the field of agricultural occupational health and safety.

CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORKS

3.1. Introduction

The first part of this chapter presents the theoretical framework utilized for this study and the second part presents the methodological framework. In each case, the framework deployed is an amalgam that combines desirable features and capacities of several approaches. In addition to guiding the early stages of an inquiry, including decisions regarding what are important problems and questions worthy of study, a theoretical framework provides a lens through which one reflects on, critically analyzes, and moves towards a deeper understanding of the findings (O'Leary, 2010; Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). It is perhaps important at this juncture to restate that the broad purpose of this dissertation is to describe the major challenges of Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training (including needs and barriers), to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges.

Given the interdisciplinary character of the study, my theoretical framework builds on different fields of scholarship: adult education, agricultural OHS, and critical ethnography. Adult education theories combine features of popular education and adult learning principles. Critical ethnography incorporates ethnographic approaches to learning from the field and the critical insights of political economy. In addition, I have drawn on a socioecological model of health to describe the various social contexts within which the OHS experiences of migrant temporary farmworkers are shaped. The socioecological model (presented in greater detail in the penultimate chapter) directs our attention to different social contexts—to different levels or contexts—in which the realities of temporary foreign worker programs in agriculture are shaped and play out: interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts. Besides incorporating social theory, critical ethnography is a powerful methodology. As a method, critical ethnography provided a general rubric for conducting the fieldwork, namely individual and group interviews, site visits and direct observation, and analysis of pertinent academic literature and primary documents. To organize and condense the qualitative field data,

and to identify major trends (or patterns) reflected in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006), I combined a thematic analysis with this critical ethnographic approach.

3.2. Theoretical Frameworks

3.2.1. Social Dimensions of Sustainable Development in Agriculture

Sustainability and Wellbeing. In general terms, the conceptualization of sustainability in relation to development has often involved embracing the idea of somehow balancing the economic, environmental, and social aspects of development (WCED, 1988; Dresner, 2009). In practice, however, many scholars and lay practitioners have paid more attention to the economic and environmental dimensions than to the social dimensions of sustainability (Bitsch, 2010). The unavoidably intermingled social facets of sustainability require more public and scholarly attention if we are to achieve a more balanced and comprehensive theory and practice of sustainability (ILO, 2004; FAO, 2005; Bitsch, 2010).

Guttenstein, Scialabba, Loh, and Courville (2010) base their definition of sustainability on principles of wellbeing. Wellbeing is understood as "the state of being or doing well in life; healthy, or prosperous condition; moral or physical welfare (of a person or community)" (Guttenstein et al., 2010, p. 10). The authors add that in order to achieve wellbeing, individuals must have the power required to exercise positive human rights—the right to food, to health, and to education for example—without compromising the rights of others (Guttenstein et al., 2010). Furthermore, the authors propose that inclusive public policies are necessary to promote the fuller expression and realization of these rights—policies, for example, that promote fuller and more meaningful participation for the various stakeholders involved in agriculture. To promote social/human dimensions of sustainable development in this sector as in others, it is necessary to pay more attention to, among other things, labour rights and culturally appropriate approaches to health promotion (Guttenstein et al., 2010).

Sustainability and Agricultural Occupational Health and Safety. For many decades, hired labour, and especially migrant farmworkers, have helped Canadian farmers to solve chronic labour

shortages (Colby, 1997; Preibisch, 2007). Hired farm labour provides much of the necessary manpower and contributes substantially to sustaining economically successful agricultural enterprises. There are many links between agricultural sustainability and agricultural occupational health and safety (Amponsah-Tawiah, 2013) but these and other social (or human) dimensions of agricultural sustainability have received only scant attention from the scientific community, from governments, from the farm sector, and from the general public.

Magis and Shinn (2009) offer a broad portrayal of key emergent principles of social sustainability. They assert that these principles include social wellbeing, equity, democratic governments, and a democratic civil society. The authors maintain that social wellbeing relates to the fulfillment of the basic needs of all members of a community. Furthermore, they argue that the social dimensions of sustainability are undermined by sociopolitical inequalities, which are also a primary driver of environmental harms. Such sociopolitical inequalities may range from lack of voice, access, and influence under undemocratic governance regimes to highly asymmetrical workplace power relations. In the latter vein, lack of any sort of effective collective representation of worker interests and lack of participation in workplace decision-making constitute important sociopolitical inequalities that undermine the social dimensions of sustainability. According to Magis and Shinn (2009), advancing the social dimensions of sustainability requires paying attention to helping individuals and communities to challenge such sociopolitical inequalities.

Along the same lines, Pilgeram (2011) maintains that agriculture may move towards socially sustainable production systems when fair laws apply to all stakeholders democratically, when "farmers, labourers, and their families are provided with meaningful and equitable employment" (p. 375), as well as when agriculture has the capacity to offer enough and affordable produce to consumers with minimal impact on the environment. The relevant social and political interests and actors include not only farmers and labourers but also consumers. All should be able to participate in deciding what social and political concerns need to be taken into account to make agriculture more socially sustainable (Pilgeram, 2011). Kallstrom and Ljung (2005) argue that farmers, labourers, and consumers all need a stronger sense of identity and community in order to

be able to act to strengthen their wellbeing and the aforementioned sociopolitical aspects of sustainability in agriculture.

It should be obvious that if farmworker health and safety is frequently at risk, then the sustainability of agriculture is in question. Sustainability in agriculture can be framed in various ways. It involves a set of goals but also, perhaps more crucially, ongoing, problem-solving and negotiation processes that encompass multiple concerns. Sustainable agriculture should be approached from a broad perspective that integrates insights from various fields of enquiry including agronomy, nutrition, health, ecology, economics, rural sociology, and public policy. More often overlooked but nevertheless important are fields such as agricultural extension, communications, and education.

The multiple dimensions of sustainability in agriculture can be advanced by implementing the principles of agroecology. Agroecological principles recognize the need for a productive agriculture that works to preserve the integrity of the ecosystems in which it operates and that provides opportunities to all the people whose livelihoods are linked to agriculture. Timmermann and Félix (2015) as well as the Third World Network and Sociedad Científica Latinoamericana de Agroecología (2015) claim that the principles and practices of agroecology promote and support: 1) food security/sovereignty, 2) autonomy to pursue locally determined models of development, 3) capacity to critically evaluate technological innovations, 4) awareness of alternative sociopolitical innovations, 5) knowledge of rights-based approaches that help people to stand up for eco-social justice, as well as 6) agricultural systems that mimic the function of local and natural ecosystems. For agriculture to be truly sustainable, it is important that economic interests and environmental concerns should not eclipse the importance of the social, in particular the conditions and concerns of farm labour. This applies equally to organic farming systems, which cannot claim to be truly sustainable if they privilege environmental practices and enterprise profitability over social aims such as providing work and workplaces that respect and develop the capabilities and capacities of the workers as well as their multiple interests and needs as human beings (Shreck, Getz, & Feenstra, 2006). Migrant farmworkers are a particular subpopulation of vulnerable, contingent workers who are trying to make their way in contemporary labour markets (Preibisch & Otero, 2014). The links between just and humane

treatment of farmworkers and what can qualify as a sustainable food system are further explored and underlined by Otero and Preibisch (2015):

> Throughout high-income countries, non-citizen migrants are a growing component of the labour market supporting food systems. The debate about "sustainable agriculture" and "sustainable food systems" has not focused enough, if at all, on the issue of sustainable and safe employment for agricultural workers. We must thus emphasize that *social* sustainability is just as important in this context as environmental sustainability, and a food system that depends on precarious workers cannot be viewed as "sustainable" (Otero & Preibisch, 2015, p. 23).

This reframing of the challenges of sustainable agriculture also puts intercultural communications, adult education, knowledge translation, and the politics of knowledge creation and sharing at the forefront. Knowledge is a key to promoting both productivity and wellbeing (WCED, 1988). It is also a key ingredient for identifying ecologically and socially sustainable ways to advancing goals of agricultural production. In a "knowledge-based economy," it is central to many questions of distributive justice, environmental justice, human rights—and sustainability. This reframing of agricultural sustainability highlights the need for all relevant actors to be empowered to contribute their observations, creativity, knowledge, and knowhow, and the necessity to effectively address barriers of language, workplace culture, inequality, and information access. For that to be possible, sustainable development in agriculture requires commitment, trust, confidence, and shared responsibility. Thus, sustainable agriculture is not only about technological innovations and environmentally sound agronomic strategies, it must also be concerned with elaborating socially advanced working relationships and networks of mutual obligation (see, for example, Timmermann & Félix, 2015).

Advancing sustainability in agriculture implies that one must consider connections between farming and all other activities and actors in the rural community, as well as the sociocultural and political interactions involved. Unfortunately, economic viability and certain aspects of ecological integrity have typically been emphasized at the expense of the various necessary components and dynamics of social sustainability. Many creative and sustained initiatives are needed to challenge and rectify this imbalance (ILO, 2004; Avila, Deve, & Mundy, 2005; Foladori, 2006; Bitsch, 2010). Bitsch (2010) and Szell (2014) contend that social sustainability in agriculture must include labour rights and the decent treatment of farmworkers. Others insist that

our conceptualization of sustainability in agriculture should include not only (agro)environmental concerns and economic prosperity but also the social wellbeing of agricultural populations and more equal access to opportunities (Baiju, 2007; NAS, 2010). Ultimately, social sustainability in agriculture is about equitable sharing of the 'goods' and 'bads' associated with agriculture—the rewards as well as the risks—while using ecologically sensitive design, organizational innovations, policies, and education to increase the former and reduce the latter (Pilgeram, 2011).

Elected leaders and civil servants have key roles to play in implementation, enforcement, oversight, and evaluation at international as well as national, provincial, and municipal levels—agricultural policies for improving social aspects of sustainability in the agri-food sector (ILO, 2003). Dialogue, co-operation, and alliances among stakeholders should be promoted at international, regional, and local levels (ILO, 2003). Social sustainability in agriculture also requires democratic fora where agricultural authorities, farmer and farmworker representatives, and community leaders can collaborate to address the most urgent needs of all participants but especially those who are the most vulnerable and frequently at risk—migrant farmworkers (ILO, 2003).

3.2.2. Adult Education

Adult education in the context of marginalized groups of people is known as popular education. Popular education is concerned with social relations and social change (Jackson, 2007). Popular education is a non-formal adult education approach aimed at enabling disadvantaged social actors to critically reflect on the social forces or power dynamics that affect their socioeconomic circumstances—and to transform these circumstances (Turay, 2005; O'Connor, Flynn, Weinstock, & Zanoni, 2014). Turay (2005, p. 481) states that "an educational process is regarded as popular if it is liberating, accessible, non-elitist, democratic, experiential, participatory, and based on the needs, aspirations and dreams of the disadvantaged people in society." Turay maintains that if such educational processes take place, learners will be able to better understand the causes of their social realities. Brazilian adult educator Paulo Freire is widely regarded as the leading proponent of popular education in Latin America (Turay, 2005). Freire claimed that his approach contributed to advancing the education of marginalized classes but also to increasing

learner/worker awareness of social realities that shape their working and living environments (Turay, 2005; Jackson, 2007; O'Connor et al., 2014). Freire's approach has been recognized and taught not only in Latin America and Asia but also in places such as Australia, New Zealand, England, the United States, and Canada (Dos Santos, 2008). Freire claimed that for real learning to take place, educational opportunities must link to the personal experiences of workers so that learning becomes more meaningful to them (Rogers, 1992).

For Freire, learning is not only about transmitting knowledge and developing skills that result in behavioural changes but also about teaching and learning how to exercise personal agency to transform the sociopolitical climate at work and in daily life (Hyslop-Margison & Naseem, 2007). For popular education to take place, the collective and democratic participation of different social actors in the community is necessary. This is why organized initiatives at the community level are crucial to promoting such forms of education and development (Cole, 2002; Turay, 2005). Freire's model, adapted in a variety of forms, has been applied successfully to the education of poor peasants and labourers in many Latin American countries, and particularly in Central America. Given that my research focuses on adult farmworkers who are historically marginalized and have low levels of education and income, Freire's educational philosophy becomes particularly relevant.

Popular (adult) education exponents argue that typical lecture formats, where instructors monopolize the ownership, legitimation, and transfer of knowledge, are not effective or adequate for underserved populations such as workers with precarious and temporary employment (O'Connor et al., 2014). When it comes to putting the insights of popular adult education into practice, OHS education programs require creative trainers who can co-construct knowledge in a more democratic and less hierarchical fashion—with and for the workers (O'Connor et al., 2014). Putting popular education into practice implies encouraging workers to interact among themselves, to learn from one another by sharing their experiences and perspectives about the problems that they may have in common (O'Connor et al., 2014). Practical training emphasizing participatory demonstrations is one of the best means to transfer knowledge and a vehicle for collaborating to elaborate workable solutions to workplace (health and safety) problems (Cole, 2002; O'Connor et al., 2014).

Adult Learning Theory. The adult learning theories of American adult educator Malcolm Knowles complement Freire's pedagogical philosophy. His observations shed light on how adults learn and his approach puts trainees at the center of the instruction-learning process (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2011). Knowles elaborated his principles of adult learning in the 1970s after observing and experiencing several important social happenings: the arrival of large numbers of immigrants, military conflict, economic depression, the civil rights movement, and the growth of the humanistic movement (Knowles et al., 2011). Knowles and his co-researchers (2011, p. 63-67) put forward six theoretical principles that are discussed below: 1) the need to know, 2) the learner's self-concept, 3) the role of experience, 4) readiness to learn, 5) orientation to learning, and, 6) motivation to learn.

1. The Need to Know: This principle suggests that trainees/learners should be informed of the reasons why it is important for them to learn something before the training commences. This step raises awareness and allows workers to distinguish the *status quo* of their initial sociopolitical circumstances from the conditions that they hope to achieve through educational initiatives.

2. The Learners' Self-Concept: Adults perceive themselves as capable of directing their lives and, because of that, they tend to want to be in charge of their own learning processes. Those responsible for offering educational interventions need to create a learning environment where adults have opportunities to co-construct what and how they learn.

3. The Role of Learner Experiences: Adults accumulate more experiences than younger people. Adult education providers need to acknowledge that adult learners are themselves vast repositories of experience and, as a result, rich sources of knowledge and skills. Further, such experiences have been lived under different socioeconomic circumstances that affect the overall quality of an adult's life and their identity. Such circumstances help to determine their learning styles, their learning needs and preferences, and their objectives and motivations. However, incorporating trainees' experiences also poses the challenge of dealing with habits, cultural assumptions, and personal ideas that may not always be positive.

4. Readiness to Learn: Adults are willing to start learning things that will help them to deal with the real challenges they face in everyday life. Adults are aware that effective learning does not occur instantaneously. They are willing to learn the theory and fundamentals of a given topic before moving onto more advanced applications.

5. Orientation to Learning: Adults are more inclined to identify problems within their work environment and to propose solutions collectively. That said, adults see learning as a problem-solving activity that allows them to put into practice what they learn. If they see no immediate utility to what they learn, their motivation to learn is diminished. This is why, within the field of adult education, it is said that adult education is "life-centered" (p. 66).

6. Motivation: Adults experience external and internal motivators. External motivations include things such as higher wages and salaries, and advancement to more important roles in organizations. Adults are internally motivated if learning leads to better working and employment conditions that increase their job satisfaction—though learning also has intrinsic rewards in that it increases one's sense of mastery and raises one's self-esteem.

Knowles and Freire both argue that education should foster individual, collective, and institutional development (Knowles et al., 2011). They also concur that the sociocultural conditions of adult learners/trainees should not be ignored. They see adult education as, in part, a process of societal transformation. A key component is consciousness raising about social circumstances that facilitate or hinder learning and engagement in educational activities as well as other normal expressions of what it means to be a human being (Knowles et al., 2011).

Education, Training, and Learning: Key Concepts. The term education is usually associated with formal systems of schooling (whether privately or publically organized). However, education can also take place in many settings outside of formal schooling systems. Rogers (1992), Youngman (1996), and Spencer and Lange (2014) suggest that education can be conceptualized as the provision of opportunities for participating in any form of organized or intended/planned interventions useful for learning. In general, education has broader goals than training initiatives do, as the scope of education is usually more comprehensive (Tight, 2002). Education provides a

knowledge base that supports more theoretically informed explanations and understandings about how and why things occur. Many would argue that genuine education also teaches logical and critical thinking (Rogers & Horrocks, 2010).

Rogers (1992) suggests that training is a subsidiary part of education because it takes the form of relatively short teaching/learning events with narrower goals. Training is focused on more practical, technical, or applied knowledge aimed at the development of specific skills, attitudes, or more efficient practices in the workplace (Rogers, 1992; Wallerstein & Weinger, 1992; Marsick & Volve, 1999; Tight, 2002; Ollagnier, 2005; Alli, 2008; Rogers & Horrocks, 2010). However, focusing narrowly on transferring information and developing skills may lead us to neglect the contextual realities of learners—realities that they will need to engage with in order to advance their lives, and realities that can have profound impacts on training efficacy and outcomes (Jackson, 2007).

In order to better understand and critique contemporary approaches to training, Ollagnier (2005) focuses attention as well on the macro sociocultural, political, and economic contexts and conditions in which training occurs. He maintains that "in this globalized society, the concept of training is closely linked with skills and expected performance that individuals have to maximize in the labour market and in the workplace" (Ollagnier, 2005, p. 618-619). In other words, Ollagnier contends that in the context of globalization, training is primarily provided in the interest of economic growth or to help enterprises to be more profitable. Rogers and Horrocks (2010) maintain that such training amounts to "indoctrination" (p. 59 & 184) in that this type of training does not provide sufficient opportunity for reflecting on and thinking critically about what one is learning. Training for the sake of acquiring and developing new skills is not necessarily a bad thing but should be accompanied by teaching methods that help learners to be creative and to think critically (Rogers & Horrocks, 2010).

With respect to learning, Rogers (1992) and Spencer and Lange (2014) agree that learning is about making changes in the ways we think, feel, behave, and know about ourselves. For Bratton et al. (2004) and Taylor (2005), learning is a process that may last various lengths of time depending on how the learning environment is structured. Social context affects learning

efficacy. Bratton et al. (2004) describe the learning climate as the set of physical, individual, and social contexts that either positively or negatively affect the abilities of workers to take advantage of educational opportunities provided at their workplaces or in the community. 'Climate' and context are obviously important when we are talking about the learning experiences of migrant farmworkers. Learning (and education) is sometimes said to take three forms that are usually associated with specific kinds of venues or settings: formal, non-formal, and informal learning (Spencer & Lange, 2014, p. 11-12). Formal learning/education implies that learners enroll in a school and are provided with curriculum by an educational institution leading to academic credentials or degrees (Spencer & Lange, 2014). Non-formal and informal learning are more pertinent to this thesis project and have been succinctly explained as follows:

> Non-formal learning/education can be organized by educational or non-educational institutions or by groups or other organizations. It is usually non-credential (essentially non-credit), part-time, delivered via linked weekends, day or week-long schools, and targeted to satisfy individual, recreational or social objectives. It is what we have always understood "adult education" to be. In a workplace setting, this could include a couple of half-day sessions learning to use a new computer operating system and figuring out how it would best work at your station. (Spencer & Kelly, 2013, p. 26).

> Informal learning can be described as learning that is predominantly unstructured, experiential, and non-institutional. It takes place as people go about their daily activities at work or in other spheres of life. It is driven by people's choices, preferences, and intentions. Informal workplace learning is often defined in terms of a series of on-the-job activities—the action containers, if you will, for such learning. But this kind of definition covers only the surface of learning—what people see when they watch someone else learn (Marsick & Volpe, 1999, p. 4). Informal learning can be conscious (explicit) and/or incidental/accidental (tacit). For example, a worker may learn on the job how to operate a machine, or what is expected at team or unions meetings, s/he will learn by observation, participation and through the experience of the work (Spencer & Kelly, 2013, p. 26). It is the learning that goes on daily, individually, and in groups. For example, a local environmental action group (or individuals in the group) might learn how to organize meetings, prepare submissions, or write newsletters as an integral part of their group activities. (Spencer & Lange, 2014, p. 12).

3.2.3. Alternative Approaches to Agricultural OHS Education and Training

The Worker Empowerment Discourse. Freire's popular education philosophy has been adopted and adapted by other authors to craft an OHS education and training framework that fits the needs of disadvantaged workers. One such framework is known as an "empowerment approach to workers' OHS education and training" (Weinstock & Slatin, 2012) or as "education for empowerment" (Wallerstein, 1992, p. 197). The principles of an "empowerment" agenda build on Freirean educational philosophy. Education and training are not only about learning how to deal with hazards and hazardous conditions at work by modifying individual behaviours. They should also help workers to acquire a place in the sociopolitical hierarchy and to establish an effective presence (agency) as social actors empowered to participate in identifying and mitigating sources of risk (Wallerstein & Weinger, 1992; Wallerstein & Sanchez-Merki, 1994; Weinstock & Slatin, 2012; O'Connor et al., 2014). OHS education and training that embraces such wider goals is generally viewed—by educators and by other stakeholders—as political. Those involved in advancing such approaches need to be aware of this reality and they need to understand that they may be seen as active participants in the politics of OHS and of worker enfranchisement (Wallerstein, 1992; Wallerstein & Weinger, 1992).

Wallerstein and Weinger (1992) argue that OHS preparation requires three interacting components to be effective for disadvantaged workers: listening, dialogue, and action. Listening to workers means that other parties need to pay attention to what workers identify as hazards and risks in their workplaces (Wallerstein & Weinger, 1992; Riley et al., 2012). For dialogue to take place, OHS educators need to be down-to-earth and approachable, and to initiate exchanges that motivate workers to express their perceptions of what is most meaningful and important for them to learn (Wallerstein & Weinger, 1992). With respect to the action component, Wallerstein and Weinger (1992) and O'Connor et al. (2014) maintain that action implies promoting change in the workplace *status quo*. For that to happen, it is necessary to establish direct communication with management both to address hazards and to push for adequate educational initiatives. Moreover, Wallerstein and Weinger (1992) suggest that, for change to take place, support will be needed from various stakeholders and community members because underserved and under-resourced workers often have trouble exercising their agency/influence. Empowerment approaches to OHS education and training would also provide workers with information about their rights (O'Connor et al., 2014). However, communicating with workers about their rights is not sufficient since

"fear of being fired, language barriers between workers and supervisors, and other such barriers may prevent workers from acting to address safety concerns at work even if they are aware of their rights" (O'Connor et al., 2014, p. 100).

OHS Principles. A starting point for OHS and OHS educational frameworks is that all workers have rights (Alli, 2008; O'Connor et al., 2014). In Saskatchewan, Sass (1981) has made a significant contribution to the theory and practice of OHS by placing workers' rights at the centre of the discussion (Smith, 2011). He is known as the architect of the Saskatchewan approach to OHS, which is also known as the workers' manifesto (Smith, 2011). According to Sass (1981, 1995) and Smith (2011), the 1972 Saskatchewan OHS Program was developed out of the recognition of three fundamental and associated worker rights: 1) the right to know (to be informed) about workplace hazards, 2) the right to participate in the daily detection, evaluation, and reduction of such hazards, and 3) the right to refuse to work under dangerous circumstances or those believed to be unusually dangerous without fear of reprisal. Sass (1986) indicates that the right to know is particularly important when it comes to dealing with hazardous chemicals in the workplace.

Furthermore, it is argued that recognition of these three rights is vitally important for preserving the dignity, respect, and self-esteem of workers (Sass 1995; Smith, 2011). Along the same lines, Baker and Stock (2006) and Hilgert (2009) argue that, to counter the power that business leaders frequently exercise over government leaders, worker OHS ought to be conceived of as a matter of dignity, and therefore as a human right. Sass and others acknowledge that OHS rights are "political" in that they raise questions about power relationships, hierarchal control, and who has any legitimate role in shaping work processes (Sass, 1995; Smith, 2011). Prevailing political climates and workplace power relationships are likewise seen as important factors contributing to success or failure in implementing workers' rights (Sass, 1995; Smith, 2011). At the international level, the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2010) proposes standards that promote the rights of migrant workers employed in all sectors. The ILO (2010) states that migrant workers often remain invisible to the societies in which they labour, and are likewise ignored in political arenas. Frequently they are not reached by those who are supposed to be responsible for OHS oversight. That said, the ILO's rights-based approach embraces the following principles:

1) Universal human rights apply to all migrants;
2) Equality of treatment, for all workers;
3) International labour standards are to apply to all workers with respect to treatment and conditions at work such as OHS, maximum hours of work, minimum wages, non-discrimination, and freedom of association (ILO, 2010, p. 172);
4) "Language and cultural differences require that instructions and training regarding safety and health at work be given in a language the workers can understand" (ILO, 2010, p. 105).

Along the same lines, the ILO Code of Practice for Safety and Health in Agriculture (ILO, 2011), proposes that OHS training programs should "cover all workers at the workplace including managers and supervisors, migrant and temporary workers and contractors as appropriate. Those programs should be provided by competent persons in a language understood by the workers in accordance with the identified needs; and include participant evaluation for comprehension and retention. […] In addition, employers should provide training to all personnel, at no cost to the worker and training should take place during working hours" (ILO, 2011, p. 44-45). Although the ILO's principles are non-binding, they provide a well founded and authoritative statement that has potential to inform provincial/local and national deliberations and initiatives. They are a basis for inquiring about the status of worker rights and OHS training in various venues, and for starting a conversation about what will be required to meet such international benchmarks. Moreover, they can provide a focus for farmworker demands for recognition and action. The ILO (2011) also encourages nations to include gender dimensions in OHS, to make sure that the health and safety concerns of women are recognized, and that both women and men have the appropriate legal protections, training, and capabilities to ensure their health and safety.

Indigenous and Other Views of Health. Alternative conceptualizations of health and health promotion, including various indigenous perspectives, can be a useful complement to other OHS approaches. Based on the Indigenous Medicine Wheel model of health promotion, Bopp and Bopp (2001) propose that the community has an important role in maintaining and improving the health of people. The authors also contend that where an Indigenous health perspective is implemented, it moves communities towards sustainability on a number of fronts. According to Bopp and Bopp (2001, p. 33), a central strength of Indigenous models of health is that mental, emotional, physical, and spiritual health are promoted simultaneously and collectively in

communities. In Mayan cultures, for example, prevention is viewed as extremely important (Giralt, 2012). Mayan healers in Guatemala, for example, recommend eating well (corn tortillas, beans, and rice), cleaning the entire living environment (house, body, food), and, particularly, cleansing the mind of worries and sadness (Giralt, 2012). Additionally, the Mayan cosmovision promotes the cultivation of medicinal herbs/plants in the household garden space or in a community garden where all can share their plant materials and exchange knowledge about how to make infusions and other medicinal preparations (Audet, Walshe-Roussel, Cal, Caal, Otarola, Sánchez, Poveda, Pesek, & Arnason, 2013). Many Latino migrant farmworkers come from home communities where indigenous ideas about health and healing circulate at least to some degree. Moreover, alternative and complementary approaches to medicine have been gaining much wider recognition and acceptance in mainstream medical circles. It therefore may be appropriate and advisable to try to better understand the prevalence of, and to explore the applicability of, such approaches. Ultimately, it may prove quite useful to selectively incorporate some such practices and sensibilities into OHS programs for workplaces where migrant workers are employed. For example, migrant farmworkers could be given space and permission to cultivate medicinal herbs and vegetables, without the use of pesticides, at the farms they are employed at. This would allow them to practice traditional health promotion and healing arts, contribute to healthier eating, and reduce the financial burden of grocery shopping. Appropriate and decent housing is also a factor for both mental and physical health. Comfortable and clean living space, adequate facilities and privacy for personal hygiene activities, and good cooking facilities are all necessary for healthier and less stressful living.

3.2.4. Critical Ethnography

This section addresses the principles of critical ethnography along with the closely associated framework of political economy, while the subsequent section introduces a socioecological model of health. Ethnography is most frequently recognized as a methodology (Creswell, 2013); however, it may also serve as theory when it is combined with other critical approaches to social science investigation, in particular political economy (Rossman & Rallis, 2012). In essence, critical ethnography is an approach to social research that investigates in depth—and for extended periods of time—the lived experiences of groups of people who share a certain number of

sociocultural conditions in common (Creswell, 2013). Details about how a modified version of critical ethnography was used as a methodology in this study are presented in section 3.3.1.

The critical face of ethnography emerges in response to the need for ways to surface and understand the roots of diverse social justice/injustice issues such as undemocratic regimes of social and political control, progressive or reactionary public policies, as well as power differentials among non-marginalized and marginalized groups (Fetterman, 2004; O'Leary, 2010; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011; Madison, 2012; Rossman & Rallis, 2012; Creswell, 2013). When conducting an inquiry using critical ethnography as a theoretically informed methodology, it is important to build trust. Like Brazilian adult educator Paulo Freire, Madison (2012) and Creswell (2013) call for establishing a process of dialogue between researchers and study participants in order to promote trust, mutual learning, critical reflection, and deeper understanding of realities experienced by the participants (Freire, 2000; Jackson, 2007; Dos Santos, 2008; Sharma & Romas, 2012; Madison, 2012; Spencer & Lange, 2014). Schwandt (2007, p. 50) argues that a central purpose of critical ethnography is to provide a critical counterpoint to "the taken-for-granted social, economic, cultural, and political assumptions" of those who possess a disproportionate measure of power and/or authority.

Political Economy. In general terms, political economy can be understood as an approach to the analysis of political power and economic exploitation rooted in the historical and contemporary development of capitalism:

> The political economy approach argues that different classes have different interests because of their economic position and the conflict between these interests is reflected in political and social institutions. Indeed, the class position of individuals influences their consciousness and practices. Economic relations are therefore seen as the main basis of social power and underlie politics and its institutionalization in structures such as the state and parties. The state in particular is a focus of study because it is identified as playing a significant role in securing the conditions for capitalist accumulation. The critical position of political economy seeks to comprehend the dynamics of capitalist accumulation as the basis for explaining the nature of society. It has taken a particular interest in the growth of the world economy, with its international division of labour and unequal development (Youngman, 1996, p. 194).

Political economy approaches are employed in many academic fields relevant to this study including adult education (Youngman, 1996), labour studies (Spencer & Kelly, 2013), and OHS education and training (Elling, 1989; Eakin & Eachen, 1998; Barnetson, 2010; Krieger, 2010; Howse, Jeebhay, & Neis, 2012), as well as rural sociology and political ecology. Broadly, political ecology can be understood as the study of the intersections between politics and the ecological sciences (Walker, 2005). Political ecology draws on political economy to look at how sociopolitical and economic power influence groups of people that have less or no power, and how such powers marginalize the interactions of people with the environment (Walker, 2005). Hence, OHS in the agriculture sector may also be studied using the lens of political ecology.

Engaging with political economy perspectives can help us to better comprehend the global context of the politics of agricultural OHS education and training (Levenstein & Wooding, 1997; Krieger, 2010). Political economy can also contribute to our awareness and understanding of issues surrounding the distribution of social and economic power, and likewise, of issues surrounding the sharing or non-sharing of knowledge and information across organizations and groups, or among individuals (Krieger, 2010). Political economy helps us to understand neoliberal globalization as the global context of OHS (Krieger, 2010). Neoliberal (or neoconservative) globalization tends to undermine worker OHS because globalized markets heighten competition and focus employer (and state actor attention) more narrowly on profitability and capital accumulation. In this climate, social and political dimensions of effective OHS practice such as workplace inspections and regulatory enforcement get pushed to the back burner (Walker, 1997; Taylor & Murray, 2009). Loudoun and Johnstone (2009) also contend that neoliberal economic globalization promotes contingent and casualized forms of work such as part-time, temporary, and seasonal employment that may not correlate positively with the implementation of effective OHS training and practices.

Under the pervasive dominant discourse of neoliberal globalization, OHS regulation is frequently viewed as unwarranted and unhelpful interference in business activities (Marié, 2006; Hilgert, 2009). Political economy is a useful approach for critically analyzing OHS within the contexts of neoliberal globalization and the temporary foreign (agricultural) worker programs that are closely associated with this approach to economic development. The overarching rationale of such

programs is to provide affordable, docile, flexible and readily available pools of farm labour when and where workers are needed—for example, in conjunction with the peaked labour demands of seeding and harvesting seasons that may occur at different dates in different regions (Thomas, 1985; Martin et al., 2006; Castles & Delgado, 2007). As Pfeffer (1983) and Thomas (1985) have pointed out, securing a reliable supply of hired farm labour has been important for sustaining both corporate capitalist agriculture and family farming—but particularly the former. In fact, some would argue that the easy availability of migrant labour pools is one of the conditions that tend to promote business restructuring and concentration in agriculture, ultimately favouring the emergence of larger-than-family, corporate farming operations. Of course, political economy is not just critique; it can also be part of programs of reform and restructuring that address economic, social, and political inequalities. While a political economy approaches reveal sociopolitical factors that may have negative implications for workers and their organizations, it can also help us to identify approaches and practices that may have positive impacts with respect to the lives of workers (Satzewich & Liodakis, 2010).

3.2.5. Socioecological Model of Health

The socioecological model of health is a framework that help us to understand how health is advanced or put at risk through actions (or inaction) at several levels, that is, in various social (or socioecological) contexts. Here it is adapted to focus on the experiences of farmworkers in interpersonal-organizational, community-level, and institutional-policy contexts. The model presented here is a modified version of the model originally proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1977) and subsequently adapted and adopted by others (see Elling, 1989; Eakin & MacEachen, 1998; Linnan, Sorensen, Colditz, Klar, & Emmons, 2001; Krieger, 2010; Baron, Beard, Davis, Delp, Forst, Kidd-Taylor, Liebman, Linnan, Punnett, & Welch, 2013). These authors tend to argue that health (and OHS) initiatives must attend to and simultaneously address micro (interpersonal-organizational), intermediate (community), and macro (institutional-public policy) contexts. Analysis that focuses only on one of these contexts yields a more limited vision of the phenomenon under study, whereas looking simultaneously at micro, intermediate, and macro contexts expands and deepens our understanding of complex phenomena such as health and

wellbeing (Linnan et al., 2001; Salazar, Napolitano, Scherer, & McCauley, 2004; Elkind, 2007; Wang, McGrath, & Watts, 2010).

This socioecological model is helpful for categorizing and analyzing the multiple interactions that take place across the three aforementioned levels/settings (Linnan et al., 2001; Salazar et al., 2004; Geiser & Rosenberg, 2006; Wang et al., 2010; Leonard, 2011; Baron et al., 2013). In chapters 5 and 6 (and particularly the former), I use an adapted version of the socioecological model (or framework) to expand and organize the discussion of findings from the field—and their implications. In doing this, I am also following the ethnographic tradition that, in order to more fully preserve the original character of participant accounts, often favours separation of interpretation from reporting of research findings (field data) (Creswell, 2013). Although some scholars consider them separately, interpersonal and organizational contexts are intimately related and are therefore addressed conjointly in this thesis. A similar consideration applies to the decision to jointly discuss the institutional and public policy contexts (henceforth the institutional-public policy context). Policies are designed and implemented in/through institutions of governance. Moreover, such policies, and associated programs, are themselves constituent parts of what sociologists would label 'social institutions', for example such patterned and politically mediated social arrangements as 'the family farm' and 'labour markets'. Farmworkers and employers are the main actors with whom we are concerned in the interpersonal-organizational context. In particular, this context directs our attention to social tensions connected with power differentials between employers and workers (and among workers). These power differentials and tensions, in one way or another, shape OHS experiences including risk exposure and OHS education. The community context refers to the resources, opportunities, and challenges that local towns and cities and the larger Saskatchewan community may offer to migrant farmworkers. With respect to the institutional-policy context, I look chiefly at the role of certain provincial institutions, policies, and regulatory programs in promoting and/or limiting the advancement of worker OHS, and OHS education and training in particular.

3.3. Methodological Framework

3.3.1. Critical Ethnography

This study employed a modified critical ethnographic approach to collecting/generating data. Initially, I planned to take a more classical/traditional (anthropological) approach to ethnographic fieldwork but settled on a more focused ethnographic approach (Pistrang & Barker, 2012; Simonds, Camic, & Causey, 2012; Cruz & Higginbottom, 2013) for practical reasons discussed in detail in section 4.2. In general, qualitative research is a systematic way of making observations and interpretations in relation to a particular environment/context. It is sometimes also known as naturalistic research (Ritchie & Lewis, 2009). It is 'naturalistic' in the sense that the researcher tries to immerse himself/herself deeply in the world of those who are being studied (Ervin, 2005). Therefore, a naturalistic approach to ethnography helps us to focus on understanding the sociocultural origins and contexts of particular groups of people, together with their experiences and perspectives (Fetterman, 2004; Hays & Singh, 2012; Creswell, 2013).

When using a classical (or traditional/anthropological) approach to ethnography, it is necessary to acquire both depth and breadth of understanding about the culture of the people being studied (Ervin, 2005; Creswell, 2013). It is crucial to spend considerable periods of time engaged in fieldwork and to combine field methods such as observing, visiting with, interviewing, as well as interacting both individually and collectively with different groups of research participants to better understand their perspectives and everyday interactions (Fetterman, 2004; Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005; Hays & Singh, 2012; Creswell, 2013). Participant observation is the main field method used by cultural anthropologists to collect ethnographic data (Simonds et al., 2012). However, Simonds et al. (2012) warn that conducting too much participant observation may be counterproductive in several ways. The method may 'colonize' the lives of those being studied (p. 158), modifying the very practices that are under study. Ethnographers doing participant observations also may lose objectivity and may assign inaccurate meanings to what they are observing (Simonds et al., 2004).

If researchers do not aim to describe all dimensions and facets of a culture-sharing group (classical ethnography), they may opt to select a subset of features or issues to be studied and over a more limited time-frame (Knoblauch, 2005; Simonds et al., 2012; Cruz & Higginbottom,

2013). Recent discussions of time-limited ethnography use terms such as *focused ethnography*, *micro ethnography*, or *applied ethnography* (Pistrang & Barker, 2012; Simonds et al., 2012; Cruz & Higginbottom, 2013). Such approaches to ethnography typically narrow the scope of the study and tend to include a more targeted approach to searching for research participants and study locales (Pistrang & Barker, 2012, p. 13). Plaza del Pino, Soriano, and Higginbottom (2013) propose some guiding principles to conducting 'focused' ethnography. They maintain that when doing focused ethnography, researchers can limit their study to a single community, organization, research problem, and/or context. They also claim that the number of research participants does not need to be large and should include only participants that have specific knowledge about the phenomenon under study. Plaza del Pino et al. also note that the study can occur "episodically" and can be conducted "without participant observation", which is typically time consuming (p. 3). Despite the time-saving advantages offered by a focused ethnography approach, there are drawbacks. As stated by Simonds et al. (2012), the major disadvantage of focused ethnography is that it "truncates some aspect of ordinary ethnographic research, whether it is the longitudinal aspect of the investigation, the scope of the topic, or the extent of social sphere or social subset to be studied" (p. 159).

Critical ethnography was employed in my study as a general approach to learning from the field (see, for example, Madison, 2012). Theoretical insights from critical ethnography guided the conceptualization of the research, and methods proposed for critical ethnography inspired the field research. In light of resource and access constraints, and in light of the need to capture the diversity represented by multiple work sites, I eventually opted for an approach incorporating many of the guidelines of focused ethnography. Critical ethnography—either in its classic anthropological versions or in more recent forms such as focused (critical) ethnography—incorporates field research methods with roots in anthropology, sociology, and critical feminist inquiry. These methods often include individual and group interviews (with questions that are structured, semi-structured, or unstructured) and observation (both participant and non-participating observation) (O'Leary, 2010). Whatever methods are chosen, a primary goal is to understand life experiences from the perspectives of the research subjects (O'Leary, 2010; Creswell, 2013). In this study, semi-structured individual and group interviews along with non-participant observation were used to generate and collect field data. With its focus on worker

experiences and OHS education, the major issues that this dissertation surfaced were issues related to intercultural communication and to worker and employer experiences and beliefs about agricultural work and health/safety risks.

Participants and Recruitment. The farmworker population of interest for this study was defined as all male and female Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers hired to work temporarily in Saskatchewan under work permits issued through the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) and the Agricultural Stream (AS). Workers with at least some experience working in these programs were considered to be potential interviewees. All the workers in this population are at least 18 years old given that this is a requirement imposed by the governments of Canada, Mexico, and Nicaragua. One must be 18 of age before one can apply to participate in these programs. Interviews were conducted in 2012 with a total of 39 Latino migrant farmworkers of whom 25 were Mexican and 14 were Nicaraguan, and 29 were male and 10 were female. They were all currently employed on one of seven Saskatchewan farms. In terms of the program under which they were working, 22 of these farmworkers (10 Mexican women and 12 Mexican men) came to Saskatchewan via the SAWP, whereas 17 came to the province under the AS (14 Nicaraguan and 3 Mexican men). No female Nicaraguan farmworkers were included in the study sample. This was unintentional: circumstances unfolded this way given the farms to which I had access. Before I directly approached any of these farmworkers to ask them to participate in the study, their employers were first contacted and provided with a letter of introduction/invitation. Employers of Latino migrant farmworkers were identified via informed members of the wider community such as University of Saskatchewan students and employees, and provincial civil servants.

When I contacted such agricultural employers about the possibility that they and/or their employees would participate in the study, I immediately informed them about the study objectives (albeit, in general terms) and about the recruitment and research protocols. Typically, I made contact a second time with these employers via telephone, fax, e-mail, or in person in order to provide more details about the research project and to invite them to participate in the interviews. As a result of the recruitment protocol adopted, the sample only included farmworkers from agricultural enterprises where the employer showed at least some interest in,

and support for, the study (some strengths and limitations of this recruitment process are further discussed in Chapters 4 and 6). It is also important to note that I invited employers to participate in the study by themselves being interviewed regardless of whether they agreed with me approaching (and potentially interviewing) their international employees.

It is likewise important to note that all the employer interviews conducted (11) were individual interviews, with only one informant/respondent participating in each. Before being interviewed, employers were provided with a letter of invitation and a copy of the employer consent form, which were sent by e-mail or by fax (although, in a couple cases, employers were only provided with these two documents on the same day as they were interviewed in person). If they acquiesced to the possibility that the Latino migrant farmworkers they employed might be interviewed as well, the employers were asked to inform these employees about the research project and enquire if they would consider participating in interviews (on a voluntary basis). As with employers, a more formal process to secure 'informed consent to participate' was instituted before any actual interviews with farmworkers.

At the time of the interview, farmworkers were provided with a letter of invitation that included, among other things, details about issues of anonymity and confidentiality. I handed out a letter of invitation (in Spanish and English) to workers (in-person), and made it clear that I had contacted their employer beforehand. Such letters of invitation were handed out to all the workers who were interviewed, whether this was in group or in individual interviews. Whether it was going to be a series of one-one-one interviews or a group interview was not predetermined. Both formats were utilized because of the particular circumstances and farmworker work schedules. For example, workers that were interviewed individually were generally interviewed in this manner because they were the only ones available the day that I visited their workplace or because they could not make it the day their coworkers were interviewed in group. I also made it clear to all the farmworkers that their participation was entirely optional and voluntary, and that they should not feel pressured by the fact that their employers had agreed to my approaching them for an interview. Some additional details about how participants were recruited are presented in the

findings chapter. All of the employers interviewed were male farm operators who ran 'family farms'[7] that were located between 25 and 250 km from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Lacking access to a comprehensive or official list of employers who hire Latino migrant farmworkers in Saskatchewan, it was necessary to seek out farmers via University of Saskatchewan contacts and civil servants who are familiar with such farmers (*referral sampling*) (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). Participating employers were also asked to help to identify additional farms that employed Latino farmworkers (*snowball sampling*) (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). Although all the employers that I actually interviewed were contacted via informed members of the wider community such as the aforementioned University of Saskatchewan students and employees, and provincial civil servants, I asked the agricultural employers with whom I had established contact to pass on my contact information (my own and my supervisor's contact information) to other farmers who might potentially qualify and be interested in participating in the study. The motivation for doing this was to 'spread a wider net' and, potentially, to increase the employer sample.

Additional interviews were conducted with two civil servants who had strong links to OHS regulation and oversight, two former Canadian farmworkers with experience working on farms where Latino seasonal workers were also employed, and two community activists/farmworker advocates. In line with my research purposes and research questions, these six key informants were selected and invited to participate in the interviews based on their experience with farmworker OHS or based on their interactions with migrant farmworkers (*purposive or judgmental sampling*) (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). These six key informants were each provided with a letter of invitation and a consent form (in English).

Interviews and Observations. In all, I conducted eight group (or focus) interviews and five individual interviews with farmworkers. All the interviews were semi-structured. Seven of the

[7] 'Family farms' is in quotes because there is room for debate as to how well all of these farms would fit some definitions of a family farm. These were all family owned and family managed farms but in some cases the majority of the labour involved was not family labour. In this sense, the labour/personnel arrangements of some of these workplaces may conflict with notions of family farms that use the criterion that family labour should account for a major part of the workforce as well as the fact that members of a particular household (or closely related family group) are the owners and managers of the enterprise.

focus group interviews involved male participants only. The remaining group involved only female participants. All these group and individual interviews with farmworkers were conducted in Spanish and all these farmworker interviews took place in the shared housing provided on the farms where they are employed. The time allotted for these interviews with workers was subject to adjustment by mutual consent, allowing the interviewee to talk until the interviewer noticed that little relevant information was forthcoming, that little new information was being shared (data saturation), or that the respondent seemed tired or uncomfortable with continuing the interview. I endeavoured to establish a natural and easygoing tone as I introduced new themes to orient the discussion.

In total, I interviewed 11 employers (individually) in English. In seven instances, the employers who agreed to be interviewed also acquiesced to worker interviews. The remaining four employers were interviewed late in the season and the migrant farmworkers employed by these four employers were not interviewed. The farmworkers employed by three of these (four) employers could not participate because they had already returned home. The workers of the fourth employer did not participate in the interviews because the employer did not acquiesce to my approaching his employees about being interviewed. As mentioned above, some additional details about recruitment and participation are presented in the findings chapter.

In sum, I interviewed a total of 39 Latino migrant farmworkers who were employed at seven farms. Reflecting the kinds of agricultural production that these seven farms were involved with, their work assignments were in beekeeping/apiary activities, horticultural nursery production, and vegetable production—sometimes in just one and sometimes in more than one of these subsectors. The four additional employers who were interviewed also managed enterprises involved in these subsectors although some were also involved, in a limited way, with fruit production. The other Canadian non-farmer informants were interviewed face-to-face or over the phone (in English). All interviewees agreed to be recorded with a digital audio recorder and signed a consent form. Topic guides for these interviews are found in Appendix F. At the end of each of the group and individual interviews, I provided a token gift to the participating Latino farmworkers: either a pen and notebook, a T-shirt, or a bag of tropical fruit. No cash payments or honorariums were offered to the Latino migrant farmworkers and no gifts or cash payments were

offered to the farmers/employers or to any other study participants. An additional data-gathering method employed was writing detailed notes to document observations about the farm and observations made when interacting with employers or workers either at the farm or elsewhere.[8]

Quality of Findings. Creswell (2013) proposes a straightforward strategy for increasing the quality of data collected in the field. His "validation strategy" includes reflection, rapport, and triangulation (2013, pp. 243-263). Creswell indicates that reflection involves the researcher being auto-critical with respect to her/his own strengths and limitations. The researcher is also expected to reflect on possible sources of misinformation, misinterpretation, or bias, and about personal sensitivities or sympathies. As for rapport, the researcher should seek to build trust and understanding with study participants and with the network of contacts that he/she uses to locate and recruit participants. With respect to triangulation, Creswell suggests that this is an attempt to confirm the authenticity of accounts provided by stakeholders through consulting other informants that provide their own perspectives on the matter/question under study. In this study, such triangulation occurred when more than one worker commented on a specific issue or event, when employees and employers independently offered their own perspectives on workplace practices and challenges, and when additional key informants likewise commented on such matters. Other sources included firsthand, personal observation and evidence extracted from scholarly sources and other relevant documents.

3.3.2. Data Processing

Drawing mainly on procedures recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2012) and Clarke and Braun (2013), I used thematic analysis to organize and process the interview data. This procedure is described below:

1. Transcription. A professional transcriptionist was hired to transcribe English-language audio recordings and was asked to sign a confidentiality agreement (Appendix G). Transcriptions (and translations) of Spanish-language interviews were completed by the author.

[8] In fall and winter months when daylight hours were short, there was sometimes limited opportunity to look around the buildings and fields. However, at three farms I did have a good chance to look around in the company of the employer. For subsequent visits, these three employers indicated that I could enter their farms as needed to connect with the farmworkers for interviews.

2. Organization of data. Transcriptions were entered into the qualitative analysis software NVivo©10 (QSR International LTD, Burlington, MA, USA) to sort the most meaningful data into overarching (or global) themes. Such overarching (or global) themes are sometimes also labelled domains of inquiry (Madison, 2012). Overarching themes are made up of specific clusters of patterned information, and these clusters are themselves repositories of meaningful chunks of information such as passages and quotes from the interviews (Rossman & Rallis, 2012). With respect to my research questions, two challenges to farmworker OHS education and training emerged as overarching themes (or issues): barriers to communication and factors related to the worker and work/workplace culture. It is important to clarify that as the major trends/themes began emerging from the field data, I was able to refine my research questions.
In fact, this was a process whereby the research questions and the field findings co-constructed each other over the course of the study. Before going into the field, I kept my research focus and research questions somewhat open. This gave me the opportunity to recalibrate the research questions to some degree as new information and new issues came to light.

3. Theme/sub-theme identification. By using the software NVivo, I was able to identify and save the organized interview transcript data into Microsoft Word© documents and printed them out. To code/identify chunks of patterned information I wrote notes in different colours in the margins (by hand, and reread these documents several times to better understand the data as a whole). The aforementioned procedure allowed me to identify and synthesize major patterns/trends that qualified as (significant) themes and sub-themes. At this point, it is relevant to cite Braun and Clarke (2012) with respect to how one identifies themes and sub-themes: "Searching for themes is an active *process*, meaning we generate or construct themes rather than discovering them. Although we call this phase 'searching for themes,' it is not like archaeologists digging around, searching for the themes that lie hidden within the data, pre-existing the process of analysis. Rather, analysts are like sculptors, making choices about how to shape and craft their piece of stone (the "raw data") into a work of art (the analysis)" (Braun & Clarke 2012, p. 63). With that said, it is important to clarify that I also drew on my field observations, my knowledge of relevant literature, as well as on my own reflections and intuition in order to better identify what were the key themes and trends emerging from the study overall.

4. Consolidation of themes. As I was rereading the printouts generated with the help of NVivo and identifying major trends/patterns in terms of worker experiences, I was also reviewing my field notes in order to revisit and compare and contrast with the (preliminary) trends/issues that I had noticed/identified (and recorded) right after completing each field interview. This procedure helped me to confirm if the sorted and coded interview data aligned with my earlier field notes in a manner that would allow me to construct a coherent and logical narrative building off the emergent themes and sub-themes. Of course, the most important considerations when it came to identifying and consolidating themes and sub-themes were the voices of participants and the patterns of experience that they reported.

To recap, according to Braun and Clarke (2006, 2012) and Harding (2013), themes are patterns, trends, or commonalities that capture major perspectives and experiences. Once recognized, these themes and sub-themes take on increased significance and meaning as key elements of the study findings. The findings chapter features detailed discussion of these key issues and provides many examples illuminated by excerpts from the interview transcripts. The findings chapter likewise includes field observations that were recorded at the time of the site visits or shortly thereafter. With respect to the presentation and analysis of research results, I have largely followed the advice of Braun and Clarke (2006) who recommend that researchers should not expound on their own analyses in the findings chapter; rather, such interpretations should mostly be reserved for the discussion chapter.

3.3.3. Ethical Responsibilities and Procedures

Informed consent and confidentiality are issues that any research that involves human subjects must address (Fontana & Frey, 2008). I followed the guidelines of the Tri-Council Policy Statement (TCPS) on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans and the requirements of the relevant University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board (REB). The ethics application for this study was approved on 10 April, 2012 (Certificate of Approval BEH#11-252). Ostensibly because of concerns about potential risks to a vulnerable population (the Latino migrant farmworkers), the University of Saskatchewan REB recommended interviewing only workers from agricultural enterprises where the employers were reasonably supportive of the

study, so this condition was ultimately incorporated into the recruitment protocol (Appendices A-E). I secured prior permission from employers before contacting any farmworkers that were employed on their farms. That is, although I had some informal (and brief) conversations with farmworkers in other locales (such as stores, restaurants, and social service agencies), I only interviewed farmworkers where farm owners had already acquiesced to my approaching their employees about participating in the study. Of course, worker participation in individual or group interviews was also on a voluntary basis. The possible advantages and disadvantages of this recruitment protocol are discussed in the concluding chapter.

3.4. Chapter Summary

This chapter introduces the main theoretical and methodological frameworks that underpin and shape the dissertation. The interdisciplinary theoretical framework combines conceptual insights and tools from the fields of adult education, agricultural OHS education and training, communication studies, labour studies, and the sociology of agriculture along with some of the central concerns of political economy that undergird critical ethnography. A socioecological model of health also informs the research and provides a framework for the critical analysis presented in the discussion chapter. In general, the theoretical framework is designed to support effective field data acquisition and interpretation, and to align the study in such a way that it can contribute new insights to the field of migrant farmworker OHS education and training. I have introduced critical ethnography and explained how it draws on political economy in order to study power imbalances among stakeholders. Critical ethnography, as a methodology, emphasises the use of field methods such as conversational interviews and observation, and I explained how employers, workers, and other informed individuals were identified, contacted, and recruited to participate in the study. The research ethics procedures followed for the study were also discussed. Finally, I have reviewed how thematic analysis was used to identify significant themes (and sub-themes) based on patterns or trends discerned in the field data. This thematic analysis revealed two overarching (or global) issues, three themes, and six sub-themes that represent principal findings presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

The overall purposes of this dissertation are to describe the major challenges of Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training, to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges. This chapter focuses mostly on findings that respond to research question number one: What are the major challenges that farmworkers encounter when it comes to learning how to protect their health and safety at work, and particularly, what are the lived experiences of farmworkers with respect to these challenges? In the first part of the chapter, I provide the context for, and a description of, the field research. This includes presentation and explanation of the study sample, additional details pertaining to participant recruitment processes, as well as a profile of the farmworkers involved.

In the second part of the chapter, I present emergent themes (and sub-themes) classified within two related overarching (or global) themes or issues: communication barriers and worker and workplace cultural factors. Communication barriers and cultural factors were found to be major challenges to worker OHS education and training. Exploring these themes, I elaborate on these challenges (and some of their major implications). In general terms, communication challenges refer to the language barriers between workers and their employers as well as other Anglophone farm personnel and professionals working in the wider community. They also refer to differences in backgrounds and in power that exacerbate problems that present themselves in the first instance simply as language difficulties. Cultural factors refer foremost to beliefs and habits of the workers. They also include, however, workplace cultures that frequently privilege the acquisition of work hours and the timely and efficient completion of work tasks over any other concerns or activities, including opportunities for learning, rest, recreation, socializing, and attention to personal health matters.

4.2. Study Sample

The field data collection was initiated in May 2012 and completed by early December 2012. The fieldwork included farmworker and employer interviews, farm visits (with observations recorded in real time or soon after the fact), casual interactions with farmworkers at other sites (e.g., shopping centers, coffee shops, churches, and NGOs), and interviews with other informed participants. Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC, 2014) reports that, in 2012, a total of 420 temporary foreign workers were employed in agricultural occupations in Saskatchewan under the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) and the Agricultural Stream (AS). With respect to the study sample, all of the 22 farmworkers who were employed under the SAWP were Mexican whereas, of the 17 farmworkers who were employed under the AS, 14 were Nicaraguan and three were Mexican. Table 4.1 provides a breakdown of the total number of individuals that participated in the formal interviews.

Table 4.1. Individuals that participated in formal interviews in 2012

Participant role/occupation	Number
Latino migrant farmworkers	39
Agricultural employers	11
Former Canadian farmworkers	2
OHS civil servants	2
Migrant worker supporters	2
Total	56

Gaining Access to Agricultural Employers and Farmworkers. As indicated in the methodology section, I recruited workers to be interviewed for the study by first inviting their employers to participate and then seeking their agreement to invite the workers to participate, again on a voluntary basis. When I approached the workers, they often commented that their employers had previously informed them about my study and that a University of Saskatchewan student from Mexico was involved. The farmworkers mentioned that their employers had told them that they should expect a visit from me and that I would invite them to participate in an interview. In other words, before I first met any of the farmworkers, their employers had informed them (in a

preliminary way) about the study and had signalled consent for them to meet with me for an interview. At four agricultural enterprises, before I started the interview process, the employer actually introduced me to the migrant farmworkers at the house where they lived on the farm.[9] Three of these four employers briefly toured me around the premises of the farm/enterprise and described what their business was about. In my presence, two of these four employers mentioned to the workers that my study was important and that I was going to provide details about their potential participation. On that same day, or on a later date, I sat with the workers and went through the invitation letter and consent forms, emphasizing that participation was strictly voluntary.

In total, I invited 19 agricultural employers to participate in my study and 11 of these ultimately participated (as interviewees). Latino migrant farmworkers associated with the agricultural enterprises of seven of these employers were also interviewed. Very few migrant farmworkers did not accept my invitation to participate in the interviews. With respect to the remaining four employers and their farms, workers on three out of four of these enterprises did not have an opportunity to participate because they had already gone home for the winter. As well, one employer did not feel comfortable having his employees approached about an interview. The remaining eight employers (out of 19 that were invited) did not participate in the study either because they did not respond to my phone, fax, and/or e-mail inquiries; because they flat-out declined to participate; or, because initial acceptance did not lead ultimately to committing to an interview. The eight employers that did not participate in my study were field and greenhouse vegetable producers, beekeepers, or ornamental plant growers. It was not possible to learn more about these eight employers and their enterprises.

Identifying potential agricultural enterprises, making contact with employers, and gaining access for interviews was a long and arduous process. I received some initial help from several University of Saskatchewan students and employees, and provincial civil servants. Sampling via referral turned out to be slow because I had to wait for the people that helped me by identifying possible employer respondents to make the initial contact with these farmers. There was

[9] It is important to note that at all the farms involved in this study, there were at least two houses and the farmworkers and employers lived in separate quarters.

additional lag time as I waited to learn whether the farmers they had contacted had agreed to (at least) consider participating in the study. After one of my contacts notified me that an employer had agreed to participate, I phoned or emailed to set up a meeting. I then had to wait until the employer and/or their employees had time to meet with me. In some cases, I met and interviewed (separately) both the employer and the farmworkers on the same day. In other cases, I first met with the employer to talk in general about my study and to interview him. In such instances, after the interview with the employer was completed, he would indicate the preferred days or dates for me to visit again to seek the participation of the workers for an interview. Sundays or weekdays with inclement weather provided some opportunities for me to interview the employers and/or workers.

This recruitment process was not only time consuming but made me dependent on others to initiate contact and to have the first exploratory conversation with prospective employer participants. In that process I lost time but also some control over the message as well as the opportunity to learn from the way prospective participants reacted to the request. Though imperfect, this indirect process seemed unavoidable. There were some privacy issues at stake with handing me names before checking with prospective participants. Moreover, this can be a politically charged topic. Some agricultural employers may resent any outside attention being focused on their enterprise, especially were OHS and migrant workers are the focus. I got some of inkling of the potentially political nature of my request through the (in)actions of certain ‘gatekeepers’ who did have connections with employers of migrant farmworkers but did not choose to assist me in making contact.

The 11 employers who agreed to be participants in this study were interviewed individually at various locales depending on their preferences and schedules. Most of these employers were interviewed at their farms but I met with one of them at a coffee shop and met with some others at an event that they were attending. It is important to note that I did not visit the farms of the four employers whose employees were not included in the study. Each of the 11 interviewed employers had somewhat diversified agricultural enterprises, though, at each farm, one commodity (or subset of specialized commodities) was prioritized over the others (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Employers interviewed by dominant subsector

Subsector	Employers
Beekeeping	5
Horticultural/nursery	2
Vegetables	4

All of the employers pointed out that they were inclined to hire Latinos because of their "work ethic" and because of the quality of their performance. All the employers also reported that they tended to hire the same Latino migrant farmworkers year-after-year. The following explanation (employer #2) was typical of the sentiments expressed: "*Same one every time, every year. We've invested a lot of money in time, in teaching, and their mistakes cost us money, so if we can get back the same ones, it's very, very good*." Some workers commented that their employers became upset if they learned that Latino workers were not going to be able to (or willing to) come back to work the next year. In addition to wanting them to return the next year, several workers reported that employers had asked them to stay on longer in a particular season. Both male and female workers seemed glad to get an invitation to work additional weeks despite the fact that women expressed more worry about the children they left behind in Mexico or Nicaragua. The approximate length of time that interviewed workers worked in Saskatchewan during the 2012 season is reported in Table 4.3, which also reveals that the female workers included in this study tended to be employed fewer months than the males who were interviewed.

Table 4.3. Approximate length of time that interviewed Latino migrant farmworkers worked in Saskatchewan in 2012

Months	Women	Men	%
2 – 4	8	1	23.0
5 – 6	2	19	53.8
7 – 8	0	9	23.0

These Latino farmworkers had been participating in temporary foreign worker programs (either SAWP or AS) in Canada from between one and fourteen years. Some of the interviewed Latino farmworkers reported having worked up to five years in Manitoba, Ontario, or Quebec prior to

being employed in Saskatchewan. The maximum number of seasons that interviewed farmworkers were employed in Saskatchewan was nine (from 2003 to 2012). Not all the aforementioned recurring seasons were worked sequentially. As mentioned above, in general the women who were interviewed stayed for shorter durations in Saskatchewan (in 2012) than the men in my sample. Several women mentioned that this was because the work on the farms where they were employed was completed earlier than in previous seasons. Because of interview time constraints, it was not possible to expand the conversations with the women or the men about the duration of their stays in previous seasons.

Interviews with Farmworkers. In total, I interviewed 39 farmworkers (25 Mexicans and 14 Nicaraguans, of whom 29 were male and 10 female). They were employed on seven Saskatchewan farms. Thirty-four of these Latino farmworkers were interviewed as part of eight group interviews that ranged in size from two to eight participants, and the remaining five workers were interviewed individually. One employer requested that his employees not be interviewed at the farm; these workers were interviewed at a local coffee shop and at the University of Saskatchewan. All of the other farmworker interviews took place in on-farm housing that was provided to the workers. Each farmworker group interview lasted between two and three hours, and each individual interview lasted between 20 minutes and two hours (with most lasting over an hour). Interview duration depended mostly on the length of farmworker responses, though groups interviews with larger numbers of participants also tended to take longer. Tables 4.4 and 4.5 present more details on the number and gender of the workers that participated in the various group and individual interviews.

Table 4.4. Participation of Latino farmworkers in group interviews in 2012

Group interview #*	Number of participating farmworkers per group
1	7 Women
2	4 Men
3	2 Men
4	6 Men
5	3 Men
6	8 Men
7	2 Men
8	2 Men

*Six group interviews were conducted at a farmworker residence located at their workplaces and two were conducted off-site.

Table 4.5. Participation of Latino farmworkers in individual interviews in 2012

Individual interview #*	Workers
1	Man
2	Woman
3	Woman
4	Woman
5	Man

*Four individual interviews were conducted at a residence located at their workplaces and one was conducted off-site.

Interestingly, one employer who agreed to participate in the interviews preferred to be interviewed in the presence of his employees. However, only one of these three workers understood much English. After finishing the interview, the employer indicated that he would leave so that the workers could be interviewed without him being present. These interviews took place in the house provided to the farmworkers (located on the farm).

Three employers toured me around their farms, introduced me to the workers, and assured me that I could visit themselves and the workers as necessary in order to complete the interviews.

These and some other employers also introduced me to some of their family members so that they would be aware of my presence on the farm. One of the employers suggested using simple Spanish with his Latino workers to ensure that they would understand (all interviews with the Latino farmworkers were conducted in Spanish). Upon my arrival at some of the farms, I could hear music that I recognized, and I noticed that the workers were listening to Latino music while working in storage sheds or other farm buildings. There was no opportunity for me to tour the facilities of the other farms because the interviews were conducted after dark or away from the farm. In three instances, the employers (vegetable producers) were interviewed at a conference organized by a grower organization. It was interesting to see that these three vegetable producers seemed to be well informed about technological innovations in their subsector. It was also interesting and instructive to have been able to listen to at least part of their conference presentations. All three employers that I interviewed at this conference briefly commented (in public) on the fact that they employ migrant farmworkers from Mexico and that they are reliant on them to make their enterprises viable/successful.

In preparation for the interviews, another employer introduced me to the workers at the house they lived in on the farm. Although it was not possible for me to tour this farm, the farmer had previously informed the migrant workers about the study, and at the time he introduced us, the employer mentioned that participating in my study was important. In my presence, the employer asked his workers to speak freely in the interview and then left the house. Given that the workers knew that I was coming, they cooked a Latin American-style dinner, which we all ate before the group interview. At dinner, the workers and I had the opportunity to develop rapport and a level of trust.

It is important to acknowledge that I could not (and did not expect to be able to) strictly follow the guidelines of a classic (anthropological) approach to ethnography. I could not do extensive participant observations nor could I always conduct the interviews on the farms where the workers were employed. Time constraints and other factors beyond my control prevented me from interacting at length with the farmworkers and their employers. Specifically, the following issues limited my ability to conduct extensive on-site observation and participation.

- Recruitment of participants (employers and farmworkers) proved to be very difficult and slow, in part because I had to rely on third parties (e.g., U of S students and staff, and provincial civil servants) to help me connect with farmer-employers.
- The participating farms were geographically scattered across the province, making it more difficult to spend extended periods at each farm as travel time and cost became an issue.
- Regardless of the location of their farms, participating farmer-employers indicated that, because they and their farmworkers were very busy, it was very difficult for either to spend more time with me.
- Opportunities for workplace observation were very limited because the employers requested that interviews be conducted on weekends when workers were off-duty, or on rainy days when the workers could not work.
- Some farmer-employers and farmworkers were interviewed off-site, e.g., at coffee shops, growers' associations meetings, or on the University of Saskatchewan campus.
- One employer requested that the workers not be interviewed at the farm, and another employer was not comfortable with me inviting the workers to participate in interviews. On some farms, I got the feeling that my welcome could easily expire. They granted me access but were a bit nervous about my presence and a bit impatient to see me finish with my interviews.

The above circumstances emerged due to a number of geographic, social, cultural, and even political and economic factors beyond my control. They most likely reflect the kinds of challenges that any researchers would face when trying to study groups of people (in this case, farmers and migrant farmworkers) who are somewhat isolated and difficult to reach, who are extremely busy and face seasonal time constraints, and who may be nervous about social research.

Interviews with Other Informants. Two occupational health and safety civil servants/officers working for the Province of Saskatchewan provided additional perspectives on OHS training and education, and on communication issues. These two interviews were conducted individually. Two other informed individuals (former Canadian farmworkers that had worked at two different farms where Latinos were employed) were also interviewed individually. As well, two members

of Saskatchewan civil society who provided volunteer support to migrant farmworkers were interviewed in a group setting. These community members had collaborated with other Latinos in Saskatchewan to organize an informal worker support group. In this dissertation, I have referred to name them as "members of the Migrant Worker Support Group." Depending on their particular experience and knowledge, these six aforementioned key informants provided perspectives related to various aspects of the study themes and sub-themes.

Aside from the formal interviews, I informally interacted with three additional Latina (female) farmworkers who I met at shopping centers. Building rapport with these three Latinas was made easier because one of these Latinas had previously learned about my study through a member of the migrant worker support group. Subsequently, I was also able to build rapport with the other two women thanks to previous informal interactions with the first Latina. In my occasional travels back to Mexico, I also spoke briefly and informally with a few Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers who were in transit from Canada. Although I met and conversed with some additional Latino/a migrant farmworkers at a Saskatoon restaurant, a church, and at a grocery store, I did not have the opportunity to engage in any type of extended conversation because they were focused on enjoying their food, paying attention to the mass/service, or busy with their purchases. While I sometimes briefly introduced myself to other migrant workers that I encountered in public places in Saskatoon, I also noticed that some of these workers were not interested in talking to me. In fact, they did not even mention their names when I introduced myself. When I again encountered some of these same farmworkers at a grocery store, and said *Hola, ¿cómo están?* (Hello, how are you?), they barely acknowledged my greeting.[10]

It is important to reiterate that, as part of the ethics approval process, I retained the option of speaking informally with workers who were not recruited via their employers. I was able to build a relationship of trust and friendship with the three Latina farmworkers mentioned above and, on a couple of occasions, we all went for lunch and casually talked about some work-related issues. Sometimes they spoke about their work without prompting. At other times they did so in

[10] I could speculate that this reticence was due to being in a hurry but it may also have reflected shyness and/or concern about engaging with strangers with unknown connections. They may worry about surveillance, and that any indiscretion or unauthorized activity will somehow get back to their employer, to Canadian officials, or to the Mexican and Nicaraguan governments. This may include a worry that they somehow will be connected to/implicated in labour organizing efforts or any kind.

response to informal questions from me, e.g., *!Que tal¡ ¿Qué dice el trabajo?* ("Hi! How's work going?"). Although the above interactions were not part of the formal interview process, and were not recorded or counted as formal farmworker interviews, they allowed me to access some additional perspectives on certain aspects of the work lives of Latina farmworkers who were working on a temporary basis in Saskatchewan.

4.3. General Profile of Latino Migrant Farmworkers

Schooling. The levels of schooling completed by the Mexican and Nicaraguan workers who were formally interviewed for this study varied considerably (Table 4.6). The majority (69.2%=27/39) had completed school to somewhere in the range of grade 7 to grade 10. Spanish was the mother tongue of these workers and was reported as the only language that they speak in their home countries.[11] The oral literacy and communications skills of the farmworkers I interviewed also varied. Some were quite ready with answers and readily able to elaborate. Others were either more reticent or had more limited ability to explain their views. While questions were framed in plain language, the topics were not all ones that these workers were accustomed to discussing.

Table 4.6. Latino farmworker schooling

Grade Completed	Number of workers		Total %
	Women (*n*=10)	Men (*n*=29)	(*n*=39)
Certificate*	1	1	5.1
Grade 12	-	4	10.2
Grades 7 to 10	8	19	69.2
Grades 3 to 6	1	5	15.3

*Similar to applied or technical school diploma.

[11] It should be noted that, given the continued use of Indigenous languages in some parts of Nicaragua and Mexico, it is likely that some of these workers had been exposed to other idioms—perhaps even in their own homes where elders may have spoken other languages (see Arcury et al., 2010). It is also possible that, particularly in the larger group interviews, such personal details did not come to the surface.

With respect to family situations, all the Latino (male) farmworkers interviewed mentioned that they are married and have children in their countries of origin. Most of the women also mentioned that they have children and most were single mothers. Migrant farmworkers participating in the SAWP and AS programs are not allowed to bring any family members along with them when they travel to Canada.

Overview of Farm Tasks Performed in Saskatchewan in 2012. With respect to the number of workers employed by subsector, 26 were employed primarily in beekeeping, four in horticultural nurseries, and nine in vegetable production. It is important to note that, in some instances, horticultural nurseries may include vegetables in their production plans and that vegetable farms may include certain horticultural nursery activities in some years. In general, the 26 workers employed in the beekeeping subsector performed tasks such as beehive cleaning and assembling, transportation of beehives to field sites, hive maintenance, honey and wax extraction, loading hives and honey containers on trucks, and unloading equipment and other goods from trucks. Workers with carpentry skills made beehives boxes and beehive frames. Others painted beehives. In years when honey production was high, the women reported that they helped with the field operations, loading, moving, inspecting, and maintaining beehives. However, most of the time their work assignment was to extract honey in the warehouse. When they were in the extraction area, they loaded the extraction machine with the frames full of honey. Loading trucks and semitrailers with full honey barrels required substantial physical strength and was a task assigned to men.

The nine workers employed in vegetable production said that they planted, harvested, and selected vegetables with no blemishes, then, washed, sorted, and packed them. They also cut seed potatoes to prepare them for planting and participated in the harvest, sometimes by standing on the mechanical harvester driven by the farmer or a supervisor. After vegetables were harvested, they were loaded onto trucks and stored in a warehouse. Vegetable boxes were also loaded into semitrailers for shipment. All the men working on vegetable farms reported that loading semitrailers with packed vegetables was one of the most important tasks at their worksites. Some workers commented that they typically loaded up to 10 semitrailers each harvest season. The four workers employed in horticultural nurseries reported that they performed a range of manual tasks

depending in part on their level of experience. Some men also operated tractors and other smaller farm machinery. The workers commented that the work was usually done in teams. It was also reported that an important task in horticultural nurseries was unloading agricultural inputs and loading trucks with plants.

With respect to pesticide use, only one worker in my sample reported having occasionally sprayed agrochemicals some years ago. He also reported that he was provided with the necessary personal protective equipment and training by his employer. However, he could not describe, or name, the type of chemical he had sprayed. It is not clear whether this worker understood usage instructions or not. It is worth mentioning that agrochemicals are not used on all farms where Latino farmworkers are employed since their use varies depending on the subsector. On beekeeping farms, such products are generally avoided or not used at all. At one farm where pesticides were part of the production system, the employer reported that his Latino workers do not spray because specialized pesticide application knowledge (instructions are written in English) and experience in using spraying equipment are required.

Although it was evident that most of the interviewed Latino farmworkers (men and women) lack knowledge about pesticides—e.g. commercial and chemical/technical names, types, formulations, uses, application methods, storage recommendations, safety, or toxicity—in general, the farmworkers interviewed did not seem too worried about pesticide exposure in their workplaces because they are not directly involved in pesticide application/spraying. On vegetable/nursery farms where certain pesticides are used, some of the Latino farmworkers reported that, whenever pesticides are sprayed (by the employers, Canadian managers, or private companies), they are instructed to stay away from the farm entirely or the treated areas for several days. In some instances, this means that workers are assigned tasks that can be completed at other agricultural locales that are also part of the enterprises.

Workplace hazards/risks vary across farms and, therefore, worker health and safety concerns are not the same at all workplaces. In the beekeeping sector, the major concerns of both women and men are the risk of getting multiple bee stings on a single day and risks associated with lifting heavy things—e.g. beehives that contain honey. Some workers commented that bees are

frequently able to get beneath their personal protective gear. Although women were not involved in heavy lifts at all the beekeeping farms, those that were reported that they feel at particular risk of physical harm due to the heavy lifting. These women are worry, for example, that they may get hernias if they continue lifting heavy objects. Men are also concerned about heavy lifting in the beekeeping sector, particularly lifting hives that are full of honey. Although the men felt able to lift these beehives, their worry is more about injury associated with repetitive lifting given the number of times that they make such lifts throughout the season. These men worry that their backs may wear out in four or five years.

On vegetable farms, although heavy lifting is also fairly common at different points in the season, it was not reported as a significant safety concern. Washing/rinsing vegetables was reported as a frequent task that occurs throughout the harvest season and is usually carried out early in the mornings. Several workers on vegetable farms expressed concerns that washing/rinsing of vegetables harmed their hands. These workers, mostly women, commented that, when the weather is cold, the water temperature is very low. After washing/rinsing vegetable for hours, their hands become extremely cold and stiff. They can experience pain and discomfort for hours even when they use gloves.

With respect to machinery hazards, several men and one woman that dealt with machinery expressed the view that entanglements and related kinds of accidents posed a serious risk. These workers reported that their employers and supervisors routinely assign and oversee work that clearly presents a risk of entanglement. One female farmworker reported sustaining a finger injury when helping Latino coworkers to attach a trailer. In summary, heavy and repeated lifts, bee stings, stiffness/pain in hands due to washing vegetables in cold water and while exposed to cold air, and machinery entanglements are the workplace safety concerns that the migrant farmworkers most frequently reported.

4.4. Key Themes

Two overlapping sets of overarching issues—communications barriers and worker and workplace cultural factors—emerge from this study as the two major challenges to farmworker OHS and to

OHS education and training. Such *global themes* represent main concluding assertions of the story revealed through the field research. The *organizing* themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389) presented in the first column of Table 4.7 are clusters of observations and ideas that help to organize the claims brought forward in sub-themes or groups of sub-themes. Attride-Stirling argues that such organizing themes can be understood as revealing nuggets of information that summarize the postulations brought forward through (and by) the sub-themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001).

The sub-themes can be understood as more *basic* themes that reflect the pattern of experiences and beliefs that provide structure to the (more comprehensive) themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001). It can also be argued that the basic themes read in isolation do not fully reveal the stories that the data can tell: "in order for a basic theme to make sense beyond its immediate meaning it needs to be read within the context of other basic themes" (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). For others, including Braun and Clarke (2006), sub-themes are simply "themes-within-a-theme" (p. 92).

Table 4.7. Themes as findings: Communication barriers and worker and workplace cultural factors as challenges to farmworker OHS and OHS education and training

Themes	Sub-themes
1. Language barriers as factors in workplace communications and workplace tensions.	1. Awareness of communication limitations. 2. Alternative communication strategies. 3. Exacerbated health and safety risks.
2. Attitudes towards OHS learning and practices.	4. Worker beliefs and habits.
3. Work organization and workplace culture as factors complicating access to English language learning.	5. Worker interest in learning English. 6. Hourly-based contracts as barriers to learning.

The characterization of themes and sub-themes draws on the perspectives of the farmworkers, employers, and other stakeholders who were interviewed, as well as on observations and

reflections documented in my field notes. The field interview findings are presented, for the most part, in the form of representative quotes. These quotes illustrate, expand on, and provide substance to the intersecting themes and sub-themes. The selected quotes reflect and condense patterns (predominant opinions) that emerged in the group and individual interviews. As was explained in previous chapters, the findings chapter does not, for the most part, include my personal interpretations or perspectives. This approach is taken in order to preserve and focus on the authentic essence and original voices of those who were interviewed (Creswell, 2013) before attempting any substantive analysis of the conversations and contexts. In general, the themes constitute encapsulations of patterns (or trends) that the participants helped to identify by bringing forward issues that they perceived as meaningful or important. The naming of the themes reflects the patterns found in the interview data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

4.4.1. Theme 1: Language Barriers as Factors in Workplace Communications and Workplace Tensions

Sub-theme: Awareness of Communication Limitations. In general terms, the topics that came to the fore with respect to workplace communications included challenges around health and safety training, around task instruction(s) and supervision, and with respect to general interactions among agricultural enterprise personnel. These latter interactions included asking and responding to questions, sharing ideas, and any other communications required to interact with other personnel regardless of background. This section provides field data that illustrate how workers and employers were cognizant of workplace communications limitations. Other informants also shared views on these issues and helped to confirm some of the accounts of workers and employers. Unanimously, all the Latino migrant farmworkers interviewed identified language barriers as the most difficult aspect of working and living in Saskatchewan (and in Canada); they all emphasized that English language skills were what they most urgently needed to acquire. This was true for men and women alike. Although (temporary) cold weather and family separation were also mentioned as important difficulties encountered during their time working in Saskatchewan, communication was regarded as the most problematic, stressful, and frustrating concern given that language barriers were almost permanently a presence in their lives both at work and outside of the workplace.

The quotes from workers, employers, and others reproduced below represent a good summation of the widely held perspective that language barriers were the biggest challenge inhibiting effective workplace communication.

Here, the language is the most difficult issue. [♀worker #26, individual interview]

Communication is the most difficult thing here. We don't speak English. We don't understand. [♂Worker #33, group interview]

If there is something that is indispensable in this country, it's the [English] *language!* [♂Worker #35, group interview]

English is the most important thing. It would be wonderful if they took a course in English. [Employer #1]

It's obviously communication; that's the biggest challenge. Most of them don't actually know English. [Employer #8]

I don't know very much Spanish, so language is definitely the number one problem. [Employer #4]

The communication was so poor. Language is huge; I think that's the biggest thing. [Former Canadian farmworker #1]

Three additional Latina migrant temporary farmworkers with whom I informally interacted in Saskatchewan grocery stores (and who did not participate in the formal interviews) echoed the sentiment expressed by the 39 farmworkers who were formally interviewed. Moreover, the two former Canadian farmworkers, all eleven employers, the two volunteers from the migrant worker support group, and one of the two OHS civil servant interviewed all agreed that the major challenge when working with, and when exchanging information and interacting with, Latino migrant farmworkers was the language barrier. This was perceived to be true as well with respect to any training that was being attempted. When employers were asked about the major challenges they faced when it came to keeping their workers safe and healthy, all of them reported that language barriers were again the main problem along with certain cultural factors that are discussed later in this chapter. Only one employer (#1) commented that something equally stressful as the language barrier was not knowing whether the same workers would be able to come back to work on his farm the following year.

With respect to Spanish language skills, only one employer (#11) reported not speaking any Spanish at all. However, this employer mentioned that, during one crop season, his Latino workers had some speaking, listening, and writing skills in English. However, in a subsequent season he employed another worker who spoke no English: "*My wife and I don't speak any Spanish.* [In terms of workplace communications] *it was all sign language* [body gestures and hand signals] *or demonstrations. So you need somebody very enthusiastic and very willing to accept sign language and stuff like that*. […] *I'm concerned when we're hiring one person; we're remote, there's only a couple people in our town that speak Spanish*."

Two members of a migrant worker support group shared their perspectives on some communication barriers that they had noticed over the course of many years of providing support to numerous Latino farmworkers in Saskatchewan. Although the specific Latino farmworkers that these members referred to did not necessarily participate in my study, there were a few workers in my sample that had been assisted by this support group in the past. The members of this support group spoke in general terms and shared the view that it was sometimes difficult for Latino farmworkers to communicate fluently even in Spanish:

> *Communication is very important. Many of them come from the countryside. They don't even ask questions in their own language—just imagine speaking in English! They can't express themselves fluently in their own language, so they tend to not ask questions in any language because they don't want to look foolish*. [Members of the Migrant Worker Support Group]

Along the same lines, when I interviewed Latino farmworkers I noticed that, although some were fairly open to engaging in conversation, others were rather reticent to speak or spoke rather timidly. It is noteworthy that this was a conversation in Spanish with a Mexican (myself) who had considerable experience communicating with farmers in rural Mexico. During certain portions of their interview, many workers (both Mexican and Nicaraguan), had difficulty communicating and articulating ideas. While the topics under discussion were not necessarily ones about which they commonly conversed, the difficulties seemed to emerge when the interviewees attempting to speak more formally in an attempt to increase their credibility. While few had had educational opportunities that contributed to higher levels of literacy, most of these

workers can communicate fairly confidently and fluently in Spanish, which is their mother tongue. It can be argued that these workers were not accustomed to the formalities that (social scientific) research interviews entail. Furthermore, I was a stranger to them and, understandably, many workers may have chosen their words cautiously. Although I attempted to create a friendly and relaxed interview environment, there were signs that some workers still felt nervous, intimidated, sceptical, and/or suspicious about my presence, about signing a formal document (the consent form), about being digitally recorded, or about being heard by their coworkers.

I did notice the workers with more formal education tended to communicate more effectively and with less reticence.[12] It is also worth mentioning that, as the interviews moved forward, most male workers gradually demonstrated increased confidence in speaking. Little by little they started participating as they saw some of their coworkers sharing their experiences and views. Interviews with the women generally unfolded in a more relaxed way. In contrast to the male workers, almost all the women seemed to demonstrate more confidence. They began conversing enthusiastically from the inception of the interviews.

Language barriers were also cited by one of the OHS civil servant who was interviewed. This experienced individual acknowledged that the OHS branch faces difficulties in directly reaching out to Latino migrant farmworkers because the branch lacks bilingual personnel. The officer used the term 'Mexican' to refer to all Latino workers and claimed:

> *Probably the largest barrier that we would see out in occupational health and safety inspecting farm workplaces where there's Mexican farmworkers would be the language barrier.* Interviewer: *And how can these language barriers be addressed?*
> *We don't have currently the capacity to have multilingual inspectors, but if we did, I happen to have someone with a heritage in Mexican. We would definitely make all attempts to bring them along if that was the situation, but we don't hire based on potential languages they can speak.*
> [OHS civil servant #1, Saskatchewan Labour Relations and Workplace Safety]

[12] Completion of formal education is an important marker of status so, as well as being less experienced with presenting their perspectives to others, people with less formal education may be more reluctant to speak out. This issue may be compounded if the interviewer is a relative stranger and of somewhat higher status (due to education).

The second OHS civil servant reported that he was aware that workers and employers face some language barriers, however, he also admitted that he was not well versed about how significant these language barriers may be at farms where Latinos are employed, and he stated that he was very interested in learning more about it. Both OHS civil servants that were interviewed indicated that all farmworkers in Saskatchewan's agriculture sector are fully covered by provincial OHS legislation, regardless of nationality (Appendix H presents the section of the legislation to which these civil servants referred).

> *Section 19* [Provincial OHS Regulations] *would apply and there's no difference for hired workers, temporary seasonal workers, than any other worker. There's no real target in* [the] *legislation. The legislation does require the employer to make sure that they're trained. I think if language is an issue for the training, then they have to ensure that they're able to solve that*. [OHS civil servant #2, Saskatchewan Labour Relations and Workplace Safety]

Sub-theme: Alternative Communication Strategies. If workplace communications were widely reported to be limited by language barriers, an important question to ask is: How do migrant farmworkers and their Canadian workplace counterparts/colleagues find ways to understand each other? This section describes how some level of workplace communication is accomplished despite language barriers. The interviews and workplace observations revealed several important strategies that Spanish-speaking farmworkers and their employers use in order to try to communicate. In general terms, workplace communication was supported with some Spanish words and basic sentences spoken by Canadian personnel (employers, employers' family members, and some supervisors). Of course, the Spanish language skills of Canadian personnel varied greatly. Only one employer in my sample was fully bilingual. It is also important to note that several Latino farmworkers, along with the former Canadian farmworkers and the members of the migrant worker support group, reported that some agricultural employers have, at least on occasion, brought in bilingual individuals (typically Latinos) to act as interpreters. The following quotes capture the prevalent perspectives with respect to communication in Spanish.

> *The first year we came* [to SK] *our interpreters were Latinos*. [♀Worker #1]
> *If he* [employer] *notices that one doesn't speak any English, he speaks to you in Spanish*

sometimes [if he can]. [♂Worker #17, group interview]

My family and I know enough Spanish. There's no problem. We can communicate. [Employer #2]

I'm getting a little better at Spanish every year. It takes some time. My guys don't speak any English. […] *I can understand them a lot more than I can speak, unless there's some type of major issue and they're going off* [speaking] *a million miles an hour. I'm, like, just slow down*. [Employer #9]

I'm trying to learn Spanish as best I can, but it takes time. It's definitely time-consuming. I'm also trying now to find someone who speaks Spanish [to act as an interpreter]. [Employer #10]

One employer (#6) reflected more deeply on the scope of his Spanish language capabilities and limitations:

"I have attempted to overcome this by using some spare time to learn Spanish, and I think I have enough functional Spanish to give clear instructions and understand the problems and challenges my workers face, although I don't have enough functional Spanish to understand the complexity of problems that they may have on the farm." I really wish I could have a conversation with each of my men. I wish I understood my workers' difficulties more. [Employer #6]

In addition to some Spanish being spoken by employers/supervisors, there were other strategies that furthered communication. For example, sign language (informal body gestures and hand signals), *in situ* demonstrations, and depending on 'common sense' also contributed to making communication possible. Some workers pointed out that this was possible because they had acquired sufficient experience after repeatedly performing similar tasks in Saskatchewan or in other provinces (principally Ontario and Quebec). Some workers also reported that they had developed some familiarity with how to work with English-speaking Canadians as well as an understanding of Canadian farm work routines and work expectations. Furthermore, workers reported that the agricultural work experiences that they had accumulated in their own countries were relevant to the work that they were expected to do in Canada. This was particularly common among the male respondents who were more apt than their female counterparts to emphasize that they could draw on, and rely on, previous work experience or training. As summed up by two

workers who participated in group interviews: *We have done that before* [♂Worker #29]. *Yes, exactly! We've done all that before* [♂Worker #32]. The following quotes explain how (at least rudimentary) workplace communication was accomplished via a combination of the various strategies including some already discussed above.

There is always someone that explains to us how to perform tasks safely.
Interviewer*: In what language?*
Mostly in English, and one has to figure it out, and one kind of understands more with some words in Spanish and signs. Some do understand, but others not too much. [♂Worker #9, group interview]
The previous years, the routine of work has helped [us to understand]. [♂Worker #21, group interview]
She [supervisor] *gave me a thumbs-up and smiled encouragingly at me. She was trying to let me know that I was doing a good job*. [♀Worker #24, individual interview]
We Mexicans—or Latinos—understand with two or three signs. Tell us only one time and we'll get it for sure! It's this! [what Canadian staff want to communicate] *Almost guessing! We're already familiar with the work.* [♂Worker #33, group interview]
We already know what we have to do, and examples help. [♂Worker #35, group interview]
[We communicate] *by making signs, and he* [the employer] *always speaks to us in English. However, we* [Canadian and foreign personnel] *combine some English and Spanish words.* [♂Worker #37, group interview]

The two former Canadian farmworkers who were interviewed had worked previous to 2012 at two different farms where Latinos were employed. These two Canadians reported that, on certain occasions, they performed tasks alongside Latinos or observed them working and interacting with other (local) personnel. One of these Canadians reported having some Spanish speaking facility. These two Canadians emphasized that, at the end of the day, Latino workers and Canadian personnel do somehow communicate despite the language barriers: *A lot of what is communicated is through action; however, in terms of translation, there's two guys* [Canadian workers] *that were supervising them* [Latino farmworkers] *speaking broken Spanish* [Former Canadian farmworker #1]. The other Canadian explained:

If the boss wanted to say something to them, they [she] *had to use hand signals.* […] *My understanding* [of Spanish] *was pretty good, but I couldn't really communicate back to them everything I wanted to say. Sign language* [body gestures and hand signals] *was usually effective; we could communicate somehow. It was my understanding that they* [employer and his family] *hire a translator every year to act as a liaison.* […] *I did hear them* [workers] *trying to speak some English with my boss and she doesn't speak any Spanish. She somehow communicated with them.* [Former Canadian farmworker #2]

Despite the fact that a majority of the Latino workers acknowledged that they did not speak English, this did not mean that they did not understand and even speak a few words of English. Almost all workers reported having learned a few (basic) words ("*unas palabritas*") in English that they considered essential to their work, particularly when working with machinery. In one group interview, two workers said: *I've learned by hearing what Canadians call the tools* [♂Worker #17]. *Yes, so have I, but we don't have conversations* [♂Worker #16]. In another group interview, one worker reported: *My boss taught me the names of things in English* [♂Worker #21].

At many of the workplaces visited for this study, Latino migrant farmworkers reported that there were one or two workers who had more capacity to speak and understand English and therefore acted as 'interpreters' for the other Latinos. Some employers likewise reported that workplace communication was supported by workers who could understand and speak English somewhat better than their coworkers. In a variation on this situation, one employer reported that he employed a Latino farmworker who had been previously employed in Quebec where he had learned some French. Since this employer also spoke some French, they could communicate by combining whatever shared knowledge of French, Spanish, and English they possessed.

We have one guy [worker] *who is probably 50 percent English. He could understand many words in English, he could talk in English, he couldn't read much in English, but he could speak it and understand. Another worker knew very little* [English], *but he was speaking in French, so we could speak some French as well.* [Employer #10]

Some of them speak very good English now, so they have a very clear understanding of what

we're saying in English. [Employer #1]
[Two workers' names omitted] *are pretty good with English. They maybe can't speak it that well, but they usually understand what I'm saying*. [Employer #4]

While I was interviewing an employer (#8), one of the Mexican workers approached to check if the interview was going to finish soon. I heard her speak English and her pronunciation was clear. I also saw her speaking fluently with other Canadian staff. The transcriptionist hired to transcribe the digitally recorded interviews captured two of her phrases: Unidentified speaker: *You* [sic] *going to be just about done?* Employer #8: *Okay*. Unidentified speaker: *I was going to talk to you about my shopping because I'm leaving*. Although this worker did not participate in my interviews, her employer (#8) shared the observation that: *There's certain ones that do know some English, but there's lots of communication that needs to be done*.

Despite the relatively well-developed language skills that some 'worker-interpreters' may possess, several expressed the need to learn more English. These and other workers added that, as a consequence of not being able to communicate as well as they wanted, they frequently felt frustrated and stressed. Some felt inhibited with respect to sharing ideas about how to innovate or to improve on certain work processes, and were also frustrated by not knowing how to make requests in English. It was interesting to note that men and women were equally emphatic about experiencing such frustrations. The following passages encapsulate these aforementioned experiences:

Another one [Latino] *arrived at this farm and spoke English fluently, and he was our hope to understand more. We relied on him for interpretation, but there were misunderstandings and arguments anyway*. *He got nervous because he didn't understand sometimes*. [♂Worker #15, group interview].
The English I speak is not enough because, on many occasions, I want to say some things, but I can't. So what's the point of trying to say something to him [the employer]? *The advantage we have is that they* [employer and his wife] *are patient with us and know some words in Spanish. I only need to learn more English. I try, right? I learn on my own, but it would be helpful to learn from someone that teaches you formally*. [♀Worker #26, individual interview]

One of the former Canadian farmworkers emphasized that, besides having been the cause of tensions, misunderstandings, and occasional mistakes and inefficiencies, language barriers limited social interaction between foreign and Canadian personnel; as a result, they did not know much about one another:

> *A translator with them at all times would have saved a lot of trouble and not even just miscommunication, but making sure your employees feel like they're appreciated because you are willing to get proper communication. So if we had had a translator at our location, that would have changed the whole dynamics of everything because then proper instructions would have been given, and we would have used the translator to get to know each other even a little bit.* [Former Canadian farmworker #2]

Echoing the need voiced by this former Canadian farmworker, Latino workers participating in four of the eight group interviews, as well as one additional worker who was interviewed individually (♀#25), commented that it was essential to have a liaison person—an individual who speaks both languages fluently, preferably a Latino/a, to regularly act as an interpreter between employees and employers. It is important to clarify that the recommendation these farmworkers made about being assisted by a liaison person emerged voluntarily from them. The workers who spoke about this need also emphasized that such a bilingual individual would be of great benefit when they were trying to access health services. Some workers also reported that they knew about a Saskatchewan employer who does hire an interpreter each season, someone who visits the farm on a fairly regular basis; they felt that more employers should be doing this. One worker summed up the need as follows:

> *If Saskatchewan patrones* [farm employers/owners] *assigned a fully bilingual person to the team, many communication problems would be solved. If they* [employers] *told us, you know what, if you happen to have a problem, contact this person because they will help you guys with the language, that would be helpful because that would facilitate things for us tremendously. That would be fantastic for us* [♂Worker #31, group interview].

An employer (#7) shared his view that, aside from the stresses that language barriers may cause for workers and employers, communication problems may also increase certain occupational risks: *Most of the employers try* [to assure] *that their workers devote time to learning English, or they have one that has spent more time here that speaks enough English to interpret to the coworkers, yet they face some difficulties because they don't understand everything, and to some extent this may imply certain risks sometimes*. [Employer #7].

Sub-theme: Exacerbated Health and Safety Risks. In two of the eight farmworker group interviews, several participants reported that they had had problems understanding or interpreting what was said to them by doctors or pharmacy personnel. Although reports of such communication problems emerged in just two of the group interviews (and did not come up in any of the interviews with individual workers), it is important to note this finding because of the strong emphasis that the workers involved put on this particular communications-related concern. It is also important because of the potentially serious consequences of any miscommunication in such settings/exchanges. In all the group and individual interviews, Latino farmworkers reported that their employers assisted them with getting to a clinic or hospital when this was necessary. Workers also reported that their employers tried to facilitate communications with medical personnel by asking the worker about his/her health problem (in Spanish and/or English) and then trying to explain the situation to medical personnel. The workers were typically also assisted by a coworker who spoke more English and would try to assist in communicating the health issue to the doctor. However, several workers also indicated that this interpretation help was frequently inadequate, and that the schedule of the coworker(s) that spoke more English sometimes prevented him/her from being present to assist fellow workers with interpretation during medical visits. Workers in these two group interviews reported that they frequently did not understand doctors and were left with questions about the diagnosis and any prescriptions they had been given. Thus, they were more likely to avoid doctor visits and any drugs that were prescribed. Given the whole situation, they frequently preferred to rely on medications and herbal remedies that they brought with them from their home countries (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015).

"*This time I ran out of medication* [brought from his country] *and went to the pharmacy* [in SK] *and they gave me pills. I was told to take one at night and the other one in the day. The*

next day I was taking the night pill in the day and got sleepy during the day at work. Then, at night I could not sleep. [♂Worker #15, group interview]
We don't know the language, and we sometimes don't take full advantage of that service [free health services]. *Why? Again, because we don't know how to speak the language appropriately—period.* [♂Worker #29, group interview]

In one group interview, several workers suggested that they sometimes saw no point in making appointments with medical personnel because, they said, it was going to be difficult to understand the doctor and the pharmacist. Moreover, they preferred to keep on working if at all possible in order to make money. As a consequence, these workers more often opted to take over-the-counter painkillers that they brought with them from their own countries or purchased in Canada. Even though they may have had access to the services of a coworker who would help with communications, several mentioned that, at times, this 'interpreter' did not fully understand what was being said by medical personnel (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015).

Other workers reported that they had been assisted by bilingual members of a migrant worker support group who were able to be present in examination rooms and to help them with interpretation. In two other group interviews, workers commented that interpretation assistance had been provided by such support groups or by other fully bilingual volunteers contacted either by their employers or directly by the workers. The interviewed members of the migrant worker support group also reported that each year they have helped many Latino farmworkers with interpretation at health centres as well as on farms in Saskatchewan. One of the Latino farmworkers with whom I conversed informally (who was not one of the workers interviewed in the formal interviews) also mentioned that members of the support group have assisted many Latinos with interpretation when they needed to visit a doctor. In general terms, there was much testimony in the interviews that language barriers and other communications issues complicate accessing appropriate health services, may increase certain injury risks, and generate stress.

Language barriers are potential factors in accidents that can put the health and safety of Latino farmworkers and of other workplace participants at risk. Such exacerbated risks are illustrated by

examples taken from three workplaces (farms) where both workers and employers were interviewed:[13]

Example 1: At one of these farms (where I conducted a group interview), I watched a Latino farmworker trying to help his supervisor to hitch a trailer to a truck. While the supervisor was backing up and checking the mirrors, the worker was moving from side to side, sometimes between the truck and the trailer. At one point, he jumped on the bumper, putting himself at risk of being struck by the overhanging portion of the trailer. The Latino farmworker desperately banged on the back of the truck, shook his head up and down, and waved his hands nervously, but did not utter a word in either Spanish or English. To make matters worse, the supervisor did not utter a word in either English or Spanish and the windows of the truck were rolled up, limiting any effective verbal communication. Once the trailer was hitched to the truck, the worker and supervisor waved at each other to mutually acknowledge that they had successfully accomplished the task. No accident occurred but the potential for injury, and the stress experienced by the Latino farmworker, were both quite evident. It is noteworthy that, at the farm where the aforementioned worker was employed, one of his Latino coworkers could communicate quite well in English. However, the two workers did not always work together (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015, p. 345).

Example 2: At another farm, there was an incident involving a harvester that had stopped when a rock jammed the works. According to the employer, while the driver attempted to dislodge the stone, a Latino farmworker who was standing on the machine (as part of the normal work process) sought to help by pulling on a nearby belt. When the rock was freed, the belt jumped ahead and this hand was caught between it and a pulley. The result was a cut requiring several stitches and leading to some lost workdays. The employer subsequently met with the workers and reiterated that they were to keep their hands clear when machinery was stopped for repairs: "*You guys don't understand how the machine works, and that's not your job. But because you don't understand, I don't want you sticking your hands in places. Don't get hurt*" (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015, pp. 345-6).

[13] The first two cases/examples were previously published (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015) and are presented here again with minor modifications.

Examples 1 and 2 help to illustrate how both foreign and local personnel, are immersed in a work environment where their occupational health and safety is at increased risk due to unaddressed communications issues. In these instances, it was migrant farmworkers who bore the brunt of the risk. However, both incidents illustrate how seasonal contract workers and their local counterparts experience elevated risk due to communications challenges and how both have unmet OHS training needs that would be best addressed through the assistance of bilingual instructors.

Example 3: A Canadian farmworker (#2) who previously worked on another farm where some of the Latino workers that participated in two group interviews were also employed, observed that communication barriers/issues were a source of significant stress for migrant farmworkers and their supervisors. The Canadian reported that one day the Latino workers were instructed to carry out a task; however, none of the work was completed that day. They had apparently understood the instruction differently and had deduced that they should take no action. The Canadian observer suggested that the workers did not ask questions because they spoke no English at that time. The unwanted results of this and similar misunderstandings could include delayed work, unnecessary extra work, and unnecessary exposure to injury, along with embarrassment, workplace turbulence, and stress. The Canadian farmworker commented: *The problem is sometimes when they thought they had to move* [stuff], *for example, "Will these heavy things be* [better] *outside?" Then the boss would come back and check, and be, like, "No, these aren't supposed to be outside, they're supposed to be just here." So they would have to move everything again. I know that happened a couple of times with really heavy things. It was a lot of extra work because of miscommunication*. [Former Canadian farmworker #2].

In the case (example) presented above, Latino farmworkers proceeded according to what they—or most of them, at least—thought they understood to be the intent of their employer. They were not able to ask questions in order to seek clarification. Despite their hesitations, the workers collectively had to make a decision according to what they thought was expected or requested. Language barriers lead them to guess as to the meaning of instructions and the intent of their supervisors. Such ambiguities can lead to extra risks and it also to stressful interactions—within the individuals involved, among the Latino workers, and between the workers and their

employers. These examples illustrate the limitations of communications that depend on gesturing and hand signals, on brief demonstrations, or on words spoken in languages in which either the speaker or the intended receiver of the message is (much) less than fluent. In aggregate, these findings support the view that language barriers increase the risks of accidents, injuries, and stress for Latino workers and their workplace colleagues.

4.4.2. Theme 2: Attitudes towards OHS Learning and Practices

Sub-theme: Worker Beliefs and Habits. In six of eight group interviews and in one of five individual interviews (♀#26), workers revealed a tendency, at least on occasion, to disregard the importance of safety-related practices such as using personal protective gear, paying attention to the need for safe operation of equipment, and attending health and safety training. In these interviews, some of the workers also showed that they were aware of potentially unhelpful beliefs and habits with respect to safety practices. The passages in this section provide an overview of worker attitudes towards OHS learning and practices. Workers participating in group interview #3 critiqued themselves and some of their coworkers for believing that they do not need to use protective gear because of their physical strength and resilience. At least some of the workers acknowledged that perceiving themselves as strong and resistant to injuries or to health problems is also sometimes unhelpful.

> *Sometimes you* [as a worker] *take off your protective gear* [when working with the beehives]. *You may have mental issues, ha ha! That's the last straw! If you have all the protective equipment, why don't you wear it? Because, you know, I'm a very macho man and I can put up with pain. It's like being a horse! Ha!* [laughs] [♂Worker #12, group interview]

Workers participating in one group interview seemed to believe that they did not really need formal health and safety training and alluded to having already acquired extensive work experience in their home countries where they had worked in agriculture since they were children. These workers also mentioned that they had received some formal training (in Mexico and Nicaragua) before coming to Canada. Their additional comments on this topic included:

We don't need to learn more because we have lots of experience. This work is all about logic. We know how to take care of ourselves at work. We have experience in this. [♂Worker #22, group interview]

Whatever the job is, one tries to figure out how not to struggle with the task. We know our stuff. [♂Worker #23, group interview]

One knows how to ensure our own safety before performing any job. Although they [employer/Canadian staff] *tell us how to do it* [perform tasks safely], *we are the ones that are supposed to be responsible for ourselves*. [♂Worker #21, group interview]

Interestingly, farmworkers participating in another group interview acknowledged detrimental attitudes and bad habits with respect to using personal protective equipment. They also suggested that changing their practice was difficult because they were not accustomed to using protective gear in their own country. Additionally, some workers in this interview mentioned that their (safety) glasses became foggy after a few minutes of use and that that was one more reason they preferred to not wear them. Workers in this group interview commented:

We don't use protective gear because we are not used to using it. It's because of the bad habits we have. [♂Worker #27]

It's a bad habit that we Mexicans have in common. It's, like, one says: "What could happen to us? Nothing!" It's because we're not accustomed to using those things. [♂Worker #33]

Yes, one says, like, "What could happen to me? Nothing bad is going to happen to me. If I get something in my eye, I'll get it out later, not a problem." [♂Worker #27]

The patrón [employer/owner/boss] *says to work here you need to wear your glasses, but we work without caring about it. Sometimes they* [employer/Canadian staff] *even take off their own glasses to give them to us*. [♂Worker #28]

Yes, we feel that we are kind of indestructible! [♂Worker #32]

In an individual interview, a woman reported that her employer provided her and her coworkers with all the necessary protective gear, but sometimes they did not wear it: *If we don't use it* [gear] *well, that's a different issue, right?* In a group interview, workers emphasized that they were not accustomed to using protective gear because people do not do such things in their country of

origin. More humorously, one worker (♂#35) said that he looked like a "fly" when he wore a helmet and glasses, and his co-worker nodded agreement and laughed. Another two workers explained: *I'm not accustomed to using it* [protective equipment]. *I mean, we are not used to it* [♂Worker #38]. Contradictions between wearing protective clothing and working quickly, efficiently, and without tiring too rapidly were noted by a number of workers: *Gloves keep our hands from working freely* [♂Worker #37]. Other workers echoed the view that gloves interfered with manual dexterity and added that having access only to low quality gloves, or to gloves that were not designed for specific tasks, gave them another reason not to use them.

In one interview, workers commented that some years ago their employer had provided (at no cost) new bicycles to all the workers, but they did not wear helmets despite the recommendation to do so. Several employers shared their frustration with respect to the ill-advised and unsafe work habits that Latino workers sometimes exhibited. The major concerns evinced by these employers were unsafe operation of equipment, poor driving habits, and that they would not take advice:

> *Sometimes you catch them getting on the tractor and you say, "Whoa. Stop. That guy is still on that trailer maybe getting something. If you go take off right now, he's going to fall off." And it's always with equipment—always, you know? Maybe with a truck or a tractor. Or one guy will be in a bobcat. You know a bobcat? So they don't think safety. They don't think if I do this right now, what can happen? That is the one biggest downfalls to the* [nationality omitted] *workers, and maybe it's our fault a little bit*. [Employer #5]
>
> *They don't think about the safety issues. We've really found that out with our workers from* [country name omitted] *with the forklifts and with the bobcat forks being up there. They'll just walk underneath. Well, you can't do that. They give you a lot of "Why? Well, it's not going to fail*." [Employer #10]

Along the same lines, another employer mentioned that his major concern with safety was that his workers needed to learn how to drive safely. He noticed that some of them did not always make a full stop at stop signs. Actually, a number of workers reported having received guidance on how to drive safely in Canada and commented that driving in their countries of origin was not

as safe as in Canada. One worker (♂#39) commented specifically that he had learned how to drive more safely in Saskatchewan.

There are evident stresses on both sides with regard to use of safety gear and participation in safety training. This is illustrated by the comments of another employer:

> […] *Riding in the front of a tractor that he shouldn't be riding on that has no seat, using ladders that are in disrepair. "I'll be careful, don't worry." Or safety glasses. It's hard to get a Latino worker to conform to rules of safety. I had to provide a lot of the personal protective equipment and take disciplinary measures. Now they wear glasses. We used to have safety orientations every spring, and I would show them the same things. And I used to get complaints because some of the people would go through the same orientation every spring, and they would tell me, "You're treating us like we're stupid. Don't you remember we took this safety orientation last year?" What they're not understanding is the nature of the Canadian safety culture, which is that everyone accepts that every year we have a safety orientation. Don't worry, you're getting paid. And they say, "No, you already did this. You should only be talking to these people*." [Employer #6]

Several Latino farmworkers remarked that they see typical health and safety training sessions or orientations as repetitive and redundant. They do not find the sessions very informative and tend to think that their previous work experiences make them sufficiently knowledgeable and capable. Whatever their views about OHS training, the Latino farmworkers who were interviewed generally affirmed that learning to speak English was the most important requirement for living and working in Canada. Nevertheless, some farmworkers mock the efforts of their Latino colleagues who do attempt to speak in English. Several male workers reported that, not infrequently, coworkers made fun of others for sounding "funny" when they tried to communicate in English with their employer. A few said that they did not really care but that they already felt self-conscious in front of Anglophones and that it did not help when other workers made fun of others. In this regard, some male workers also reported that language-related bullying among male Latinos had likewise been common in other Canadian workplaces where they have been employed. The following comments bring forward experiences and issues related

to language bullying: *Whenever I try to speak English, there are some coworkers that go, like, "Hahaha! Poor fool," and they criticize me, but I don't care* [♂Worker #31, group interview]. *If we listen to them, then we are screwed* [♂Worker #27, group interview]. *As I told you, we shouldn't care what others may think of our pronunciation* [♂Worker #33, group interview]. *Yes, exactly!* [♂Worker #32, group interview].

Despite these tensions, the workers who had been mocked because of their limited English portrayed themselves as responsible people for attempting to speak at least some English. While they acknowledged that their pronunciation was imperfect, they were proud that they could speak some words or sentences that facilitated communication with English-speaking personnel. These Latino workers recognized that they needed to make attempts to speak English regardless of any limitations or teasing. They believed that if they were inhibited about trying to speak English, they would only be compromising their own wellbeing, health, and safety. Interestingly, the female farmworkers interviewed did not report the presence of bullying related to English proficiency among their female coworkers. Apparently, this is one of the special risks of being a Latino farmworker working in workplaces with other male migrant workers.

While issues related to attitudes, interpersonal behaviors, and English language proficiency were commonly cited problems, the limited formal education of many farmworkers is an important underlying issue when it comes to learning health and safety fundamentals and other practices that might contribute to their wellbeing. The migrant worker support group members who were interviewed indicated that they had provided general advice to many Latino farmworkers about how to care for their health. Regrettably, some workers appeared not to appreciate or not to respond to the well-intentioned sharing of such information. The support group members also observed that low levels of education played a role in workers not understanding the importance of safety training and related instruction. Moreover, regardless of reading skill level, many Latino farmworkers were not accustomed to reading formally written instructional materials. In the words of one migrant support group volunteer: *Many of the Latinas that come from rural areas barely know how to read and write.*

4.4.3. Theme 3: Work Organization and Workplace Culture as Factors Complicating Access to English Language Learning

Sub-theme: Worker Interest in Learning English. Language barriers have obvious potential to compromise worker health and safety. For farmworkers working in Anglophone Canada, communicating more fluently in English is likely to help to reduce health and safety risks. Not surprisingly, almost all of the Latino workers interviewed (all except one) reported that they were really interested in learning English. Almost all the workers also mentioned that they had brought learning materials with them from their home countries in order to be able to study by themselves if they happened to find some spare time while in Saskatchewan. Workers in four group interviews mentioned that they had brought study aids such as bilingual videos, CDs, tapes, or DVDs, dictionaries, books, and pamphlets. Interestingly, workers in one of these groups reported that all the workers sharing housing (in Saskatchewan) gathered to watch movies in English and that they would try to decipher what the actors were saying while also reading the captions in Spanish. It is also worth noting that, at most of the houses where I interviewed Latino migrant farmworkers, I saw large TVs equipped with DVD players. Members of the migrant worker support group also reported that "*many employers provide satellite TV with Mexican channels, twenty-two channels so they don't get bored*."

One group of workers that was very interested in learning more English asked me to teach them informally. I agreed and we gathered to do this on two occasions at the farm where they worked since their employer was also enthusiastically supportive of the idea. Several workers also asked me for advice on how to select and purchase English language learning materials (such as DVDs and dictionaries) in Saskatoon. Some of them also asked me to buy these materials for them because it was difficult for them to find time to go to purchase them. When we met again, they immediately reimbursed me for the materials (approximately CAD $100). Some workers commented that, in the future, they also would try to find time to learn English in their home countries: *My intention is, as soon as I get back to Nicaragua, to pay for English classes—to learn at least some basic things* [♂Worker #39, individual interview].

Nevertheless, most workers agreed that the most expedient time for them to learn English is when they are in Saskatchewan because this afforded more opportunities to practice. Some others suggested that studying English anyplace could be *okay as long as one has dedication* [♂Worker #35, group interview]. Many of the workers remarked that, while they are in Saskatchewan, they are likely to have some spare time to learn English on weekends. Other workers reported that they attended free English language classes provided by members of the migrant worker support group. When visiting the farms where they lived, I noticed that most of the houses were equipped with wireless Internet that was used by many workers to communicate with their loved ones. A few workers commented that they sometimes also used the Internet to find free resources with which to learn English. Given that the schedules of many workers were irregular, most were not able to commit to attending English classes offered in urban centers. However, several workers mentioned that late afternoons and evenings were the times that they were most likely to be able to attend classes. They were unsure whether there were English language instructors available to teach on weekends, though that too might be a workable time for them. The migrant worker support group has been helpful to many of them, for English language instruction and for other kinds of support some of which was offered in the locales where they are living and working. Members of the support group have provided free English classes in an urban classroom setting and at some of the rural workplaces where these Latinos are employed.

Some workers also reported that their employers were interested in them learning English and had made transportation arrangements in order for them to attend classes. Members of the migrant worker support group also stated that some employers seemed ready to facilitate transportation to English classes. One of the support group members stated: *I think that employers may offer transportation after work so that the workers can arrive on time to English language classes.*[14] Interestingly, when I was in the process of identifying and recruiting farmworkers to participate in this study, I visited a couple of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that provide free English classes to newcomers in Saskatoon. At one of these organizations, I saw a small group (five or six) of Latina migrant farmworkers attending English

[14] In fact, some employers provide free rides to places where free English classes are offered. With respect to transportation, some employers reported that SAWP contracts require employers to provide free transportation from the airport to the farm (and *vice versa*) and to make a vehicle available to the workers for grocery shopping. Employers accessing foreign workers through the AS tend to offer the same free airport rides and day-to-day transportation.

classes at about three in the afternoon. This suggest that some workers may be able to attend classes on weekday afternoons perhaps as a result of downtime at their workplaces or perhaps because their employers see English classes as a enough of a priority that they will juggle work schedules to accommodate attendance.

The workers who live near urban centers have more opportunities to attend English classes and to go shopping than those who live further away from cities. However, even when workers are interested in learning English and have employers who are supportive, unpredictable work schedules generally make it difficult to attend classes regularly.[15] For many workers, the irregular schedules also make it difficult to find time for socializing. Unless there is pressing work on the farm, Saturday evenings and Sundays are often dedicated to attending church or socializing with other Latino workers and Latino residents in Saskatchewan. Sometimes this includes having dinner at Latino restaurants. Employers usually provide a ride or maybe even a vehicle. Other workers receive rides (to and from the city) from Latino or Canadian friends. When work is interrupted by bad weather, most workers stay at home and use the time to clean house, do laundry, call home, chat with coworkers, watch TV, or read. However, when there is work that can be done regardless of weather conditions (e.g., in warehouses), workers are generally eager to get the additional hours and will forgo almost any other activity.

Sub-theme: Hourly-based Contracts as Barriers to Learning. Despite a strong interest in learning English that nearly all the workers evinced, many of them also stated that, at least from Monday to Friday, finding spare time to learn was not easy. Workers also mentioned that fatigue or other things that they had to do on weekends such as cleaning up or buying groceries also limited their time for studies. The following excerpts are representative of their statements on this topic: *Our schedules make it difficult to attend classes* [♀Worker #7]. *We can't learn too much because of our schedules, and when we go home we just need to rest* [♂Worker #17, group interview]. With regards to farmworkers and studying, members of the migrant worker support group also testified that: *They do hard work and, by the time they go home, the last thing they would do is to devote*

[15] The same would likely apply to employers interested in taking Spanish classes though they have more control over their time and more mobility. They could also elect to pay for and attend such classes in the off-season.

time to learning. What they want the most is to go eat, rest, and sleep because they have to get up very early in the morning.

Because these workers are employed under hourly-based contracts, the more hours of paid work they obtain, the higher their income. Indeed, a significant number of the workers who were interviewed suggested that income is the most important consideration for migrant farmworkers. One beekeeping worker (♂#22, group interview) used bees to comment metaphorically on their situation: *We are like bees swarming to find a place to hive and produce*. This same worker also explained that *migrating is about improvement,* that *it's about overcoming*. Almost unanimously, the interviewed Latino migrant farmworkers stated that improving their household earnings was the only reason for coming to Canada.

In six (of eight) group interviews and in one individual interview (♀#24), workers emphatically and repeatedly stated "*Venimos a trabajar*" or "we come to work" as their most important motivation or goal for coming to Canada. Other workers expressed the same priority in different terms: *We have to take advantage of the time we spend here* [in Saskatchewan]. Another worker (♀#24) put it like this: *I don't come to travel, I come to work. I come because of* [economic] *necessity*. All the interviewed women and men agreed that there are few job opportunities in Mexico and Nicaragua, and wages are very low but life is becoming more expensive. Workers in these and other interviews also reflected on the difficulty and inconvenience of being away from their families and argued that their absence from home needed to be compensated by dependable access to significant dollar earnings. During one conversation a Latina farmworker was backed up by all the other workers present when she explained:

> *We want eight hours a day Monday to Friday, but instead sometimes I work overtime one day, and after that there may not be work to do for one week. Na!* [♀Worker #2]. *Yes, a minimum of eight hours a day, the work should be stable for at least six months because for anything less than that it's not worth it. Otherwise I'd be better off with my children back home* [♀Worker #1]. W*ithout working* [sufficient hours], *and being here with this cold weather, I'd rather go back home to be with my family* [♀Worker #6].

The above excerpt likely also reflects the reality that women experience more pressure and stress because most of them have to leave their children with grandparents—seniors for whom taking care of children is a significant burden. Women seemed to be even more anxious than men with regard to obtaining more hours of work because they need to make money to support their children but also these elders—typically the parents of the woman who is working in Canada. Because the grandmothers were frequently also single mothers, the children may in fact be left in the care of one elderly woman. The presence of children as part of this scenario reflects the fact that these women are typically of childbearing age. These children help to make the migrants more dedicated to working, and they help to ensure that the migrants will indeed be temporary: they will voluntarily return to their countries of origin when the authorized period of Canadian employment ends (McLaughlin, 2009).

While in Canada, most migrant farmworkers communicate with their children via internet. However, they also spend money for prepaid phone cards so that they can talk with their families. Women especially spend significant sums for phone cards. Some men seem to be somewhat less worried and stressed about their children. For one thing, the children are typically at home with their mothers rather than with grandparents. Family members who are left behind in Mexico or Nicaragua also spend money on phone calls to Canada. Most workers (women and men) try to buy a cell phone in their countries of origin so they can text with their loved ones. Whenever they are about to run out of minutes, they ask someone in their country to buy more minutes on their behalf.

The pressures and stresses that are part of being a farmworker working far from home are not wholly invisible to their employers. While Canadian employers may benefit from the inequalities inherent in these international arrangements, they are frequently conscious of at least some of the difficulties that their employees are facing. Almost all the employers made comments that suggested that they were aware of the workers' motivations, needs, and vulnerabilities. One employer (#6) provided some frank reflection on the situation: *I have to keep reminding* [myself], *these are not people with equal opportunities as me. These are people with less choices, and I cannot put myself in the position of taking advantage of that, even though it is very easy to do.*

In 2013, after I completed the formal interviews, I ran into some Latino (male) migrant workers in Saskatoon and we went to eat dinner together at a Latino restaurant. They commented that before the season ended, their employer had, on several occasions, taken his entire crew (Latino and Canadian) out to dinner at that restaurant in a show of appreciation for their work. They also reported that he had organized soccer and baseball games for them in order to provide opportunities for socializing and relaxation. Other workers volunteered that their employer invited them to dinner each year on Thanksgiving, which proved a welcome chance to socialize, share stories, relax, and practice English with the employer's family.

Because of the uncertainties that many workers had experienced with irregular work hours in the past, they reported that they tended to work as many hours as they could (as were offered) in order to maximize their incomes. They said they proceeded in that way because it was not always easy to predict how many hours of work they would obtain long-term. Aside from insecurities associated with such scheduling uncertainties, many workers explained that their main goal was to maximize their income. To ensure the income they wanted, they would opt to work long hours even if they knew that their schedules were more consistent and regular. One employer (#4) communicated that he was aware of the eagerness of the workers for more hours of paid work and commented that he took steps to avoid overworking them: *They always want to work so many hours, you've got to stop them sometimes from working*. Fortunately for the workers participating in the SAWP (Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program), no rent is charged, which allows them to send home or take home more of the money they earn. In contrast, workers employed under the AS (Agricultural Stream program) are required to pay rent, which is deducted from their wages. However, according to one Latino migrant farmworker (♂#14) who was interviewed for this study, depending on the employer, not all the AS workers are required to pay for their housing.

One of the Latina farmworkers with whom I conversed informally explained why she was interested in, and even anxious for, more hours of work. Besides being interested in increasing her income, she mentioned that she used work as a way to cope with her preoccupations and concerns. Although she was the only worker who specifically provided this explanation, her

account is thought-provoking and meaningful, and allows us to gain another perspective on the 'work ethic' displayed by migrant workers:

> *I usually ask* [employer name omitted] *for a really hard-working and busy position, otherwise I get bored. If that happens, I sometimes feel as if my wage is not worth it. I feel bad if I don't work hard, seriously, because I am serious when I say that I am accustomed to really working. If I do not approach my job that way, I will be thinking about my family and worrying about how they are doing back home; thus, I'd rather work hard*. [Latina farmworker. Adapted from author's field notes]

Despite the fact that workers expressed dissatisfaction with their irregular schedules, some also acknowledged that agricultural work is often weather-dependent and that this affected the hours of work available. One (♀#2) of the most experienced workers explained that, with beekeeping for instance, the number of hours of work did not depend on her employer's managerial skills. She explained that, in the apiary sector, workers are aware that the amount of work frequently depends on the canola crop's planting, flowering, and harvest dates. She added that if planting times are delayed, honey production may also be delayed and reduced. Consequently, the number of hours of work would also be reduced. It is important to reiterate that two-thirds of the workers (26/39) who were interviewed were employed in the beekeeping sector.

While the rhythm of activities at apiary enterprises often depends on crop conditions on other people's farms, three of the employers also explained that production schedules and work hours on their farms depended directly on weather conditions. One employer (#5) shared the following observations: *In Canada we have to go, we have to go. And especially in farming, when you're harvesting, you have so many days, right? You know the snow is coming. You have so many days. We have to go now. We have to go, fast, fast, fast, work, work, right? Because we know, soon, the time is over and you're done. If it's not done, it doesn't matter. You're done*. Another farmer-employer (#3) explained: *Weather affects our work plan of course. Always in agriculture, how early, how late we work. It's seasonal and the season changes. We don't know—there's so much variability, so we can't control that. We're slaves to that*.

4.5. Chapter Summary

The findings presented in this chapter mainly address the first research question of this dissertation: What are the major challenges that farmworkers encounter when it comes to learning how to protect their health and safety at work, and particularly, what are the lived experiences of farmworkers facing these challenges? The field findings revealed that communications issues, particularly language barriers, and personal and workplace cultural factors along with certain aspects of migratory labour regimes and seasonal agricultural work are the major challenges to worker agricultural OHS education and training. Language barriers and workplace cultural factors have the potential to put workers' OHS at risk. Workers bring with them certain attitudes and habits that challenge the establishment of workplace health and safety practices. Moreover, the seasonal migratory labour regime, agricultural work flows and processes, and workplace culture may all contribute additional challenges as they interact with individual and group orientations, priorities, and attitudes.

Language barriers lead to impoverished workplace communication. Occasional or repeated misunderstandings contribute to tension, stress, and frustration among Latino farmworkers and local personnel. Moreover, they add to the risk of unsafe practices or accidents, interfere with open and fluid communication between supervisors and workers, and interfere with the exchange of information that might improve work processes and working experiences. In addition, language barriers sometimes discourage workers from visiting a doctor due to difficulties understanding medical advice and the instructions given with prescriptions. In some cases, this lack of easy and effective communication also encourages (improvised) self-medication. Communications barriers and certain peculiarities of the culture of both migrant farmworkers and their workplaces combine in ways that have negative impacts for Latino farmworkers, employers, and locally hired staff. Cultural factors such as worker beliefs and mindsets lead them to underestimate the usefulness of health and safety education and training, as well as the need for and utility of personal protective equipment. Ingrained habits with respect to unsafe use of vehicles, machinery, and equipment exacerbate the risk of accidents and injury.

The unpredictable and highly variable work schedules combined with some other characteristics of the workplace (e.g. geographic isolation, limited space and privacy) may also play roles in limiting the time that workers are able to devote to learning English—despite their stated interest in doing so. Workplace culture is deeply affected by the fact that these workers are foreign nationals employed in agricultural enterprises under seasonal, hourly-based contracts. In agriculture generally, and in some of these labour-intensive subsectors especially, work schedules are often irregular. This, together with the challenges of arranging transportation over significant distances, prevents many of these workers from attending any language classes offered on a regular schedule. The contracts that they work under also help to keep workers focused on obtaining as many hours of paid work as they can in order to maximize their (Canadian) income. In the face of uncertainties about the season and weather conditions, the workers make every effort to maximize their paid work hours. They are in Canada because they face urgent financial needs in their own households, and they want to work as much as possible because being away from their families must be compensated (in some manner) with income they send or bring home. This work regime has implications for the health and safety of Latino migrant farmworkers, including mental health risks, exacerbated risk of injury, and risks that chronic and acute health problems may, by-and-large, may go untreated.

In the light of understandings drawn from critical ethnography and from contemporary adult education theories, these and related findings are discussed further in the following chapter. The discussion is organized in part in relation to the three contexts highlighted in the socioecological model of health: the interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts. This framework provides opportunities for expanding the exploration of factors that may be involved in shaping the overall experiences of workers in ways that pertain to workplace health and safety and to questions surrounding OHS education and training. The socioecological framework is helpful for expanding our appreciation and understanding of the working and living environments that affect farmworkers, and especially the contexts relevant to the living arrangements of Latino migrant farmworkers, their work experiences, and their highly regulated integration into the Canadian labour market. The discussion integrates my own interpretations of the field evidence with those of key authors who have laboured in these and related fields of inquiry.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5.1. Introduction

In global terms, the overall purposes of this study are to describe the major challenges of Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training, to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges. This chapter offers a fuller discussion of the research findings and focuses in particular on providing answers to research question number two: What are the implications of related interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts (or circumstances) for farmworker OHS education and training? I discuss and analyze the findings, focusing on the themes and sub-themes that emerged from the interviews, and presenting additional reflections and interpretations. The discussion is organized around the themes and sub-themes identified in the previous chapter with particular attention to the nested social contexts of the socioecological model of health that has been adopted and adapted for use in this inquiry. These themes are: 1) Language barriers as factors in workplace communications and workplace tensions, 2) Attitudes towards OHS learning and practices, and, 3) Work organization and workplace culture as factors complicating access to English language learning. Given the wider scope of the data, themes one and three are discussed in light of the all three contexts. Because its main concerns revolve around the culture of workers (personal and interpersonal aspects) and the workplace (organizational or enterprise aspects), theme number two is discussed mainly with respect to the interpersonal-organizational context.[16] I also reflect on the larger meaning of the findings, on interactions among the aforementioned contexts, and on the ways that effects emanating from these several contexts likewise interact.

[16] Attitudes towards OHS learning and practices are, of course, not only a product of local circumstances and experiences. These attitudes and practices are, in part, societal attitudes and practices and are built into assumptions about 'normal' trade-offs between speed and safety, job completion and the need for rest, the human body as an instrument of production versus exposure to risks, and short-term goals versus possible (or predictable) long-term consequences. These ideas and orientations transcend any particular workplace and, in fact, any particular nation. This reality is highlighted when we consider the situations and worldviews that are encompassed in an international temporary worker system. It is understood that these workers will be doing jobs that are not attractive to Canadians and that, at the very least, they will be taking on risks associated with long-distance travel and long-term separation from family and home community.

5.2. Theme 1: Language Barriers as Factors in Workplace Communications and Workplace Tensions

Sub-theme: Awareness of Communication Limitations. Problems related to language barriers turned out to be the most salient set of issues that surfaced in the field research. This theme was a central one in that it was prominently represented in the responses of all five groups of social actors that participated directly in the study: Latino migrant farmworkers, agricultural employers, Canadians recently employed as farm labourers, provincial civil servants with responsibilities related to OHS, and volunteers who were active in a migrant worker support group. In fact, this theme was reflected in the observations of almost all 56 individuals who participated in the field interviews—albeit with some variation in terms of identification of causes, consequences, and possible or necessary responses. Nearly all of the farmworkers, employers, and other respondents acknowledged that language barriers negatively affect daily interactions in the workplace and likewise have negative repercussions when farmworkers need to access health care services.[17] I noted that the workers emphasized the significance of this issue and showed signs of stress when they described their struggles with language barriers. Their frustration was reflected in unhappy facial expressions and lamentations that, season-after-season, the *status quo* of workplace communications remained almost unchanged. In the interviews, neither the Latino farmworkers nor their employers minimized the significance of language barriers. In fact, language barriers were identified by virtually all the interviewed Latino migrant farmworkers as the major challenge of being employed in Saskatchewan. Although cold weather and family separation were also serious concerns for most Latino migrant farmworkers, the workers seemed to accept these as manageable[18] and a necessary "price to pay" for the opportunity to earn Canadian dollars that they could send home as remittances.

[17] It is important to note that it is unlikely that all stakeholders are aware of the extent to which language barriers exist, not to mention their impacts. For example, one of the interviewed OHS civil servants mentioned not being very well informed about the extent and significance of language barriers between Latino farmworkers and their employers.

[18] For some farmworkers, family separation was perhaps not such a big concern because they came to Saskatchewan for only two, three, or four months out of the year. Of course, this concern could vary with all sorts of personal factors such as age, gender, personality, the presence of young children, family member health concerns, and the health of their marital relationship.

As most of the respondents reported, language barriers are a fairly constant and unrelenting problem that come to the fore whenever migrant farmworkers interact with their employers, non-Spanish speaking coworkers, or members of the local or larger Canadian community including neighbours, retail clerks, civil servants, airport employees, taxi/bus drivers, and medical personnel. Workers feel and become more vulnerable as a group because of the detrimental effects of living and working without effective communication. It was an unanticipated finding of this field study that language barriers can also affect farmworker family members living in Mexico or Nicaragua. Family members may also struggle with (and stress over) language barriers should one of them need to make a phone call from Mexico or Nicaragua to Canada to communicate about an emergency; there is no guarantee that they will be connected with someone who speaks Spanish. To complicate matters, some workers do not have a landline at home, so a family member (usually the partner) has to go to the nearest store in town to pay for long-distance phone calls. Even such short trips may be dangerous for women given that, in certain areas of Mexico and Nicaragua, crime is a serious problem. Such dangers are worse at night. Fortunately for many migrant workers and their family members, the use of cell phones helps family members to communicate by sending texts from the comfort and relative safety of their houses.

Employers also frequently mentioned that language barriers are the greatest challenge when interacting daily with Latino farmworkers and when providing general job and OHS training to these workers. Although many employers had made some efforts to remove or reduce language barriers, they recognized that these barriers persist in the daily interactions of workers, both in the workplace and off-site. While they may not be aware of all the associated risks, the field research revealed that most if not all employers were aware that language barriers can interfere with workplace communications and worker wellbeing. Most of the employers who agreed to be interviewed had taken certain initiatives to learn some Spanish, and many had likewise encouraged their Latino workers to learn English. Language barriers were still evident, however, and both workers and employers continued to experience the negative consequences of such barriers, albeit not in the same manner and not to the same degree. Because they were involved with temporary seasonal employment, both parties knew that the workers would go back to their home countries sooner or later, to contexts where the workers do not use the English language,

and they would no longer face the same linguistic barriers. The 'temporary' nature of the arrangement likely allows all the actors involved to avoid addressing workplace linguistic barriers or to acknowledge the real and potential costs of their inaction. In particular, the 'temporary' arrangement takes pressure off the host country and the employers who also benefit from the program.[19] In the context of temporary foreign worker programs, Canadian employers are not required to take any test to certify that they have even basic Spanish language skills, nor are they required to hire certified interpreters to facilitate communications between themselves and migrant farmworkers. Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers who wish to enroll in international employment programs are likewise not asked to meet any English language proficiency test.

Similar to findings reported by other researchers (see Perilla et al., 1998; Hennebry, 2012), this study also found that migrant farmworkers who spoke somewhat better (even if broken) English are quite frequently assigned informal supervisory responsibilities over their Latino coworkers. Employers seemed to build more rapport with these 'English speaking' farmworkers. Frequently, employers depend upon the more bilingual workers and may come to trust them more. As a consequence, these farmworkers acquired a measure of workplace authority over their Latino coworkers. These informal hierarchies and supervisory arrangements can create challenges for the workers enlisted in these roles but even more so for the workers with poorer English skills. Where there is some sort of favouritism or abuse of authority, these less fluent Latino workers may not feel able to communicate their concerns to the employer or to Canadian supervisors.

Echoing the findings of Hennebry (2012), this study found that the unequal situation is compounded when employers choose to communicate to the other workers through one or more employees that become the *de facto* Latino supervisors. Such informal supervisory arrangements can produce tensions and inequities. Other workers may worry (legitimately or not) that their

[19] I put 'temporary' in single quotation marks because the arrangement is not necessarily short-term. Some workers stay as long as six or eight months at a stretch, and they return to the same employer year after year. The temporary nature of the arrangement is, of course, asymmetrical in terms of power to end, extend, or repeat it. Employers have more discretion in this regard. But the temporary character of the arrangement may also be a disincentive for employers to invest in education or other factors that affect the wellbeing of these workers. For one thing, there is no guarantee that the same workers will be returning to the same site in following years.

Latino ‘supervisors’ will take advantage of their power and relatively privileged positions as they distribute work assignments and hours of work. Given that such practices and hierarchies are frequently unacknowledged, and given that language barriers (and fears of retribution) may prevent affected workers from alerting employers or anybody else about the situation, prejudicial and unfair worker-to-worker interactions may multiply and be perpetuated (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015).

Sub-theme: Alternative Communication Strategies. Cultural, language, and communications style differences are important when it comes to employing workers from different nationalities and communicating effectively with them. According to intercultural communication theories, people have a better chance of establishing mutual understanding if they share the same cultural heritage and language (Dima, 1990; Bakic-Miric, 2012). In the study sample, although not measured systematically, it was evident that the Spanish-language capabilities and cultural knowledge of employers varied. At some workplaces, the employers spoke and understood a considerable amount of Spanish, and one or more other family member had also acquired some basic Spanish. At other workplaces, none of the Canadians involved spoke or understood more than a few words of Spanish.

While there are advantages to having multiple members for the employer’s family who can interact with the Latino farmworkers in Spanish, limited facility in the language can lead to miscommunications. Moreover, if several family members share the role of manager and/or supervisor, misunderstandings and unnecessary work can result because different family members may expect the workers to do different things, and they may not agree on priorities or on preferred procedures. To complicate communication challenges further, some supervisors who were also foreign nationals had very limited capacity to speak Spanish even though they were fairly fluent in English. Such arrangements can add complexity to workplace communications challenges and intensify language issues. Multiple cultural differences bring into play dissimilar worldviews, work habits and expectations, styles of nonverbal communication, and conventions of interpersonal interaction, all converging in one agricultural workplace. Besides dedication to hard physical labour under conditions that may be less than ideal, Latino migrant farmworkers have to make good use of their observation skills, intuition, and mental processing capacities in

order to make sense of instructions provided in broken English or Spanish, or via quick demonstrations and hand signals. These mental efforts consume energy and time.
In addition, ambiguities and doubts can generate stress that may contribute positively but more likely negatively to job performance. A positive effect may be that workers have to stay more alert to 'catch' and process messages. On the negative side, workers have to invest extra time and effort to understand or decipher workplace communications. This is tiring, distracting, stressful, and may slow response time, all of which may also exacerbate occupational risks. The worst-case scenario would be an accident and/or injury as a result of not understanding instructions and not knowing how to ask questions in English. As members of the migrant worker support group mentioned, many workers avoid asking questions because they do not want to create turbulence or look foolish or incompetent and thereby hurt their chances of being rehired in subsequent seasons. Of course, this is in addition to any reticence they have about trying to speak in English. Those workers who do not understand as well or as quickly come to depend on coworkers who better understand instructions given in English (or in basic, broken Spanish). Channelling questions to Anglophone employers or supervisors through 'English speaking' Latino coworkers was reported to be frustrating and discouraging for most workers.

Whatever factors contribute to any disinclination to ask questions and seek clarifications, there is certainly a need for further investigation from both sociocultural and behavioural perspectives. Unfortunately, many workers seem to settle for this situation and do not strive to improve their English, especially since their principal goal is to maximize their number of hours of work and thus income. Under the regime of seasonal, temporary, precarious, and uncertain employment, the workers focus their attention on working hard and they come to view communication difficulties as an ordinary and unchangeable aspect of their working lives (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015). While employers may struggle with language barriers in the workplace during work hours, Latino farmworkers must struggle with these barriers both in the workplace and in their daily lives in the community/region. To some degree, they may come to consider such limitations, inconveniences, annoyances, and indignities in the workplace and community as a normal part of working and living in Canada. At work, they may get used to limited communications and "resign themselves to the idea that sign language together with a few mutually understood words in Spanish and English must suffice" (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler,

2015, p. 344). In fact, several of the male farmworkers who were interviewed seemed proud that they were usually able to understand instructions based on a few hand signals and a couple of words in English and/or Spanish. Some said that by just seeing the employer walking towards a certain spot, they could almost immediately guess what was about to be requested. As a game and form of mental exercise, such a 'communication system' may sharpen the acuity and increase the alertness of the workers. However, having to guess as to what is required or about to be requested is not a reliable means of facilitating occupational health and safety, effective collaboration, or harmonious and low-stress social interactions in the workplace.

Many of the Latino farmworkers that I interviewed rated verbal information/communication as more valuable than written information. This may reflect what are often low levels of formal education. However, it is important to appreciate that in rural Latin America, even for those with more formal education, exchanging information verbally is more common than any other mode of communication. It was noticeable in the interviews that the Latino migrant farmworkers communicated and built rapport through talking, gesturing, sharing anecdotes, expressing their sense of humour, and friendly (positive) teasing. However, these communications practices and cultural patterns may be harder to sustain in Canada because the farmworkers often face difficulties meeting up with other Latinos in their host communities. It would certainly be a challenge, but nevertheless a worthwhile initiative, to try to figure out how to incorporate such disarming and engaging communications styles into training programs and even language instruction. Humour, it seems, goes a long way to reducing stress and opening up channels of communication. In general, the women I interviewed seemed even more ready to use humor than their male counterparts. Some women even made fun of their vulnerable situations by making ironic jokes during the interviews.

In addition to the alternative communications strategies mentioned in previous paragraphs, most of the farmworkers that were interviewed relied on their work experiences to decipher workplace communications and indicated work processes. Thanks to significant agricultural work experience in their home countries and, frequently, in Canada as well, the workers were typically fairly skilled at solving problems and working without detailed instructions and close supervision. Effective action in the workplace was made possible due to their skills, capacities for

logical reasoning, and willingness to work together and to share knowledge. Of course, prior work experience can also be a problem when it leads workers to believe (or assume) that they already know how to accomplish a given task or that they already know how to adequately protect their health and safety. Such assumptions have potential to put health and safety at risk.

Although not certified interpreters, some bilingual Latinos in Saskatchewan have helped farmworkers and employers to bridge communication barriers in the workplace and occasionally beyond. The field interviews revealed that, to aid with communications and interactions between workers, employers, and medical personnel, some employers had also brought interpreters to their farms on certain occasions. However, many of the Latino farmworkers, the former Canadian farmworkers who were also interviewed, and the interviewees who were members of the migrant worker support group all suggested that the presence of interpreters (or perhaps, fully bilingual farm personnel) should be more frequent because this would have the potential to fundamentally alter the dynamics of the workplace and associated work processes, along with interpersonal interactions in the workplace and in the hosting communities. Of course it is important to admit that the chances of finding bilingual Latinos living in communities near these workplaces, that can help with (at least informal) interpretation, are not necessarily high.

Because most Latino migrant farmworkers employed in Saskatchewan are housed and work in (or outside of) small communities that are scattered throughout the province, they have limited opportunity to interact and communicate with each other. Many of the farmworkers involved do not even live in a community because the farms where they are housed and work are located at least several kilometres from the nearest rural population centre. When workers are able to communicate with other workers, they take the opportunity to informally exchange information and knowledge. However, as noted, these exchanges do not occur frequently due to transportation challenges and the difficulties of finding each other across larger geographic distances.[20] To some extent, as has also been reported by researchers working in other Canadian contexts (McLaughlin, 2009; Hennebry, 2012), migrant farmworkers seem to be invisible to locals. This is

[20] There is certainly no directory of migrant-employing enterprises that they can access, so they must rely on informal intelligence gathering and on chance encounters in order to locate other Mexicans or Nicaraguans working in the region. This is likely also facilitated to some extent by sympathetic community helpers such as the volunteer members of the migrant worker support group, but it might be one of the things that hired interpreters/liaison professionals could also facilitate in a more consistent way.

likely even more the case in Saskatchewan given the dispersal of the agricultural enterprises involved and the relatively small numbers of migrant workers employed—in any one location and in total.

Sub-theme: Exacerbated Health and Safety Risks. As the findings of this study reveal and as suggested by Hennebry (2012), language barriers also have the potential to exacerbate health and safety risks under certain circumstances. Although examples of direct links between language barriers and intensified OHS risks emerged in only four of the eight group interviews, if such issues are not addressed they can jeopardize the health and safety of both local personnel and migrant farmworkers. In these four group interviews, the exacerbated risks were mostly related to increased potential for physical harm. The major risks may occur when workers deal with farm machinery and associated equipment, for example, conveyor belts, other unshielded machinery parts, and motorized vehicles such as tractors, bobcats, and forklifts. Heavy lifting is also an important risk, especially given repetition and inadequate instruction or arrangements.

It is important to reflect more on the risks of physical injuries. Whether one is in Mexico, Nicaragua, or Saskatchewan, farm work can be hard and unpleasant. Farm work routinely involves exposure to the elements as well as exposure to dust, sun, moulds, and other irritants and toxins (see Preibisch & Otero, 2014). To be successful as a farmer and as a farm employee (whether migrant or local) workers have to be willing to deal with some of these discomforts and risks. To be viewed as a good farmworker, they also have to be willing to push themselves when already tired, and be willing and able to tolerate things such as low light, cold, heat, biting insects, wet vegetation and muddy conditions, and allergens and zoonotic diseases (see McLaughlin, 2009; Arcury et al., 2010; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). On the one hand, farmworkers are expected to be vigilant about correct use of protective gear, careful to follow all safety protocols, and willing to take the time to study the same. On the other hand, they are frequently expected to work even when conditions are far from ideal and safety protocols are not fully implemented. This presents contradictory messages and may put farmworkers in contradictory positions. There is also a tendency to individualize such OHS issues when, as mentioned above, standards and attitudes are also collectively/socially enforced (or overlooked) at the level of groups, enterprises, communities of practice, or in society as a whole.

Ultimately, almost all the interviewed farmworkers reported challenges caused by language barriers in their workplaces and, indeed, from the moment of their arrival at Canadian airports. While not all workers perceived that their physical health was at greater risk because of these language barriers, almost all the workers had to deal with the increased stress and frustration caused by not being able to communicate effectively. Paradoxically, the field interviews revealed that, where employers speak a fair amount of Spanish, some workers may lose interest in devoting time and energy to learning English as they no longer see the necessity. However, even if employers speak Spanish fluently enough to make themselves understood, Latino employees who lack English language skills are still at a disadvantage when trying to access needed health services or when out and about in local communities.

Language barriers can negatively impact access to medical care. When workers need to see a doctor, for instance, most are dependent on others for assistance with interpretation. The people the workers depend on can include their employers, coworkers who know some English, acquaintances, or volunteers from a migrant worker support group. However, due to scheduling or other personal commitments, such assistance may not always be available. Without interpretation assistance, communication gaps and resulting confusion with respect to medical treatment may occur. Moreover, some farmworkers may avoid talking about or reporting any personal health issue due to privacy issues and, especially, due to their fear of losing hours of work or being laid off. Coupled with the inconveniences and costs associated with transportation to medical clinics (McLaughlin, 2009), language barriers were reported as an important reason why several interviewed migrant farmworkers stated they preferred to rely on herbal remedies and medicine brought from their home countries rather than to visit Canadian health clinics. This finding is in alignment with the McLaughlin's (2009) findings in Ontario. In addition, the interviewed farmworkers avoided visiting health clinics because they do not want to lose hours of paid work; this parallels the findings of Thierry and Snipes (2015) who studied health treatment delays among migrant farmworkers in the US.

In sum, the availability of bilingual medical personnel at health clinics and at other medical facilities seemed to be uncertain and infrequent, and the availability of fully bilingual interpreters seemed to depend mostly on the presence of volunteers from a poorly funded migrant

farmworker support group. The migrant worker support group is a key community resource for Latino migrant farmworkers in Saskatchewan. Members of this group are bilingual, and they volunteer to provide interpretation services for workers and employers (at farms and clinics), thus minimizing the costs of interpretation services that some stakeholders might otherwise incur. It was apparent that these support group volunteers were greatly appreciated by the farmworkers and by the employers. However, they cannot assist all Latino farmworkers in the province and they have the added burden of covering their own transportation costs when they travel to some of the agricultural enterprises involved.

Interviews with the two provincial civil servants with responsibilities related to farmworker OHS also revealed that Spanish language capabilities are not a criterion in agency hiring or staffing decisions. One of these civil servants stated that the OHS Division had not employed bilingual personnel who could also serve as liaisons among stakeholders. Another civil servant suggested that if inspectors are not bilingual, then interpreters should accompany them when visiting farms where Latino (and other foreign) migrant farmworkers are employed. With an interpreter present, the migrant farmworkers would be able to speak for themselves and have an opportunity to directly participate in OHS inspections and evaluations.

In addition to the potential of language barriers to increase health and safety risks, certain policies of the agricultural temporary foreign worker programs also can negatively affect migrant worker OHS. For instance, Latino temporary migrant farmworkers are required to have pre-departure medical exams when they are first hired and every time that they apply to be rehired (Pysklywec et al., 2011; Read et al., 2013). Both, Mexican and Nicaraguan migrant farmworkers also must undergo medical exams when an employer offers them employment for a subsequent season. Such pre-departure medical exams have to be carried out by doctors who are approved by the Canadian authorities (McLaughlin, 2009; Faraday, 2012). However, it is notable that these workers do not undergo any medical exams when they finish their work assignment in Canada (Preibisch & Hennebry, 2011; Read et al., 2013). Hiring Latino migrant farmworkers that display at least basic indications of good health seems to be a priority for the Canadian government but making sure that they are still healthy when they finish their season of employment in Canada might not be such a priority. Perhaps those who oversee agricultural temporary foreign worker

programs are not too interested in uncovering and documenting any occupational health and safety concerns that might be revealed by medical exams that would be administered at the end of the working season. They likewise appear to be disinterested in the existence of significant language barriers between Latino migrant farmworkers and their employers as well as other relevant and important actors such as OHS inspectors and medical personnel. Public policy that insists on pre-season medical exams but omits medical exams prior to departure from Canada is not neutral. Health problems that develop or are aggravated while working in Canada do not register on the financial bottom line of the agricultural enterprises involved, nor on the accounts of the Canadian public health system. They become individual, private liabilities or something to be dealt by the health systems of the sending countries.

Labour-sending governments could insist on post-season medical exams for Latino migrant farmworkers but this seems unlikely. Such foreign employment programs are quite important both for regional economies and the national accounts of these countries (remittances represent an important injection of hard currency and offshore jobs help to reduce unemployment rates). Moreover, the farmworkers involved have low socioeconomic status and limited political power. Of course, if post-season medical exams were to be arranged, efforts would need to be made to ensure that bilingual personnel were involved and that the results would be available in Spanish as well as English. It should be acknowledged that such exams might also open the door to difficult and protracted negotiations given the possibility that any health issues discovered would be subject to debates concerning the degree to which it had something to do with work experiences in Canada.

For their own wellbeing and peace of mind, Latino migrant farmworkers need some basic proficiency in speaking and understanding English. They also need some basic English language skills in order to have at some degree of autonomy and independence from those on whom they are otherwise extraordinarily reliant—employers and supervisors who may speak some Spanish and fellow migrant farmworkers who may speak and understand a bit of English. In their workplaces as well as in the community, workers who are dependent on others may be vulnerable to various physical, social, and psychological risks. In the context of temporary foreign worker programs, English language skills for Latino migrant farmworkers may be understood as one of

the important social determinants of general and occupational health and wellbeing. Finally, if more Latino farmworkers were able to communicate more readily in English, the dynamics of the workplace might change in a number of positive ways (McLaughlin, 2009; Hennebry, 2012). Such changes would relate not only to workplace health and safety, but also to improvement of some work processes. For example, if workers and employers could communicate better, employers and workplaces might benefit from the creative ideas and accumulated knowledge of their foreign employees. Many of the interviewed farmworkers discussed how, in their view, at least some of their work could be done more efficiently and effectively if it were organized and approached differently. A number of interviewed farmworkers seemed disappointed that no one asked them or listened to their ideas with regard to possible ways to improve certain work processes. Ultimately, the workers have a hard time making themselves understood on many smaller and larger issues. The cumulative effects can be significant.

5.3. Theme 2: Attitudes towards OHS Learning and Practices

Sub-theme: Worker Beliefs and Habits. Interviews with workers and employees revealed that many (male) farmworkers harboured certain unsafe attitudes and replicated certain unsafe practices that may have been quite common in the agriculture sectors of their home countries. These included poor awareness of safety issues and protocols, and limited use of protective gear. According to Charon (2002, p. 91), “Culture is a perspective on the world that people come to share as they interact.” These male Latino migrant farmworkers had pre-existing beliefs and habits that could compromise their safety at work, beliefs and habits had been part of their “worldview” and way of being and doing for many years.

During the interviews, several of the male farmworkers reflected on how their attitudes could compromise their safety at work and as well as the safety of other personnel. For example, in contrast to the female workers interviewed, the male workers tended to believe that they were physically strong enough to perform arduous work without using personal protective gear. Many men joked about their lack of protective gear and the unsafe working conditions. Though they may have perceived themselves as strong, resistant, resilient, and relatively indestructible, these men may also have been attempting to bolster their own self-confidence in the face of risks that

they felt they could not control—or which were too random and long-term to justify taking cumbersome measures that could slow the work and increase their fatigue. They verbalized this with statements such as, "*No va a pasar nada*" or "nothing (bad) is going happen."

Another attitude that could compromise workplace safety is the tendency of some (especially male) Latino workers to not take health and safety seriously and to tease those who do. In Latino culture, many people have a good sense of humour and enjoy laughing and teasing. This may become problematic in some instances, for example if workers do not wear their protective gear because they feel they look silly with it on. They make fun of themselves or others and give funny nicknames to each other when they wear the gear. This same propensity to tease or mock may also contribute to creating language barriers that can negatively impact health and safety. For instance, some male Latino farmworkers make fun of their coworkers who try to speak English in the workplace, teasing them for "sounding funny." While some workers are quite tolerant of such teasing, others may feel embarrassed or uncomfortable and may decide to not try to speak English or to wear the safety equipment. This adds stress and is a situation that has the potential to lead to tangible harm as well as erode relationships among Latino migrant farmworkers. More study is needed about the potential effects of this type of bullying among the male Latino farmworkers.

There are other issues and concerns that apply to both male and female Latino migrant farmworkers with respect to use of personal protective gear. As suggested above, some workers do not wear protective gear (e.g., gloves, helmets, glasses, or respiratory masks) because putting on and using the gear slows them down. In addition, many workers simply do not understand how to correctly fit and use certain protective equipment, which is likely due to language barriers that get in the way of OHS training. As a result, they either do not regularly use the equipment or they may misuse the equipment in ways that undermine its effectiveness and may even create additional risk. Some of the interviewed workers also indicated that they sometimes do not use protective gear because it is ill-fitting, uncomfortable, or of poor quality.

In the interviews, I got the sense that some male Latino workers believed OHS training to be unnecessary or redundant, that they felt they did not need more training or knowledge because

their work experiences in their home countries and on other Canadian farms were sufficient preparation for working safely in Saskatchewan. In other words, they felt that the accumulation of practical work experience and skills made them sufficiently knowledgeable and vigilant. Many male farmworkers expressed ideas that pointed to a belief that working safely is a matter of using common sense and logic. Some male Latino farmworkers subtly indicated that "*No somos ningunos tontos,"* or "we are not (any) fools", and so therefore they would know how to avoid workplace accidents. The women were more likely to acknowledge the possible risks and to place greater value on training, though this was not a guarantee that they would follow all recommended practices.

When talking about heavy lifting for example, women often acknowledged that not wearing a safety belt for back support and not following advice on how to lift and carry heavy items could lead to injury. The women seemed to acknowledge that looking after their health is important. In fact, women seemed to possess a broader view of health and its importance. During the interviews, some women stated that *"La salud es todo"* or health is everything, meaning that health includes physical, mental, and emotional wellbeing, but also, perhaps, that without one's health, one has nothing. Their perception of good health included the wellbeing of loved ones and they emphasized that if their loved ones are okay, they themselves will be okay as well.

When asked about workplace health and safety training or orientation sessions, many of the men and some of the women seemed ambivalent about the sessions and stated that they were boring and repetitive. Perhaps many of them do not fully understand how occupational health and safety and OHS education and training can benefit them and such limited awareness contributes to not taking OHS and OHS education and training as seriously as they otherwise might. Of course, there may be several complex issues and truths involved here. The workers may be resistant to studying (or learning) OHS in part because the training may not be engaging or fails to connect with what they perceive to be important realities of their workplace. They may be rather bored and alienated or depressed in general, which would limit their openness to training. Deep down, they may also hold attitudes that are fatalistic or macho—or both. Findings from the present study seem to align at least somewhat with the research of Arcury and Quandt (2009) and Schenker (2010) who found that macho attitudes prevent many farmworkers from engaging

seriously with OHS learning, workplace safety evaluations, and suggested safety protocols. Moreover, language and cultural issues may complicate the situation: if the training is not in Spanish (or is in broken Spanish), they may be disinclined to take the time and to make the effort to try to understand.

Of course, not all the interviewed men and women farmworkers routinely work in an obviously unwise and unsafe manner. Those who reflected on the fact that they had on occasion performed tasks without following safety instructions or without using safety gear were aware of this lapse and of their more regular bad habits. It is important to note that it was largely at the initiative of the Latino farmworkers that we talked about their prior beliefs and habits and the need to modify them. Some others related how, over the course of some years of being exposed to OHS training in Canada, and of observing coworkers (migrant and local) who adopted safer practices, little by little they had 'absorbed' better practices and attitudes. Interestingly, several farmworkers also acknowledged that the group interviews we did together were helpful for developing personal and interpersonal awareness of the need to put into practice more positive workplace safety habits. I noticed that the group dynamic promoted collective/participatory dialogue and that the farmworkers shared their perspectives and reflected on the need for individual and interpersonal change. In other words, I noticed that the group dynamic of the interview served as an opportunity for reflection and 'co-counseling' about issues such as taking care to avoid accidents or undue exposure to risk. This leads me to reflect on the potential efficacy of such 'talking circles' for raising consciousness and sharing experiences and information related to health and safety.

During the interviews, I noticed that farmworkers tended to not use the formal term *capacitación* or training; instead, they used *"Orientación"* (orientation) or *"Una plática"* (a talk). A number of workers referred to safety training as *"Asesoría"*, (advice or counsel), while others used combinations of words such as "*Nos dicen como hacerlo*" (they tell us how to do it). Workers also simply said, "*Sí nos dicen*" (they do tell us) to communicate that they were trained, informed, and warned about hazards/risks (at least to some degree), and that they were provided with workplace orientations and instructions. Almost all farmworkers were unfamiliar with the phrase "*Salud y Seguridad en el Trabajo*," or Occupational Health and Safety. Such terminology

is not widely used in their home communities, or not used at all, but apparently, it is also not something they hear while in Canada. Therefore, I took care to make sure that they understood what I meant by OHS education and training. Only two (male) farmworkers said that they were familiar with this terminology and that they had received OHS training in connection with employment in their home country of Nicaragua. They explained that this training focused on international quality standards for purposes of certification of workplace environmental quality control systems. These two workers briefly described that they were taught how to operate forklifts and to perform heavy lifts safely, and mentioned that the training was important for them because, besides feeling safer, it gave them the sense that their *patrones* (employers/bosses) cared about the workers. This training was delivered in Spanish and appeared to be meaningful for these two workers who said that they felt more prepared for their Canadian-based employment as as result of receiving the OHS instruction.

The employers who were interviewed tended to evince similar perspectives with regards to the habits and beliefs of Latino migrant workers. They tended to be aware that there were cultural/national differences and seemed to share a common perspective that worker attitudes are cause for concern, especially when it comes to (male) workers operating cars and pickup trucks, and agricultural machines such as tractors, forklifts, and bobcats. The employers were worried about unsafe attitudes because they increase occupational risks that potentially affect the individual and the entire crew (local and foreign workers). Referring to some of their Latino employees, employers frequently stated something to the effect that “they don’t think safety” and they do not properly follow safety rules. Employers also complained that their workers often did not wear their personal protective gear or attend safety orientations, and that they seemed to make light of safety risks. They were also concerned about the driving habits of the workers. Employers were worried that the unsafe attitudes and practices would increase the potential for accidents and injury in the workplace and on the roads. Employers seemed to struggle to get some (male) workers to understand that safety should be viewed as an imperative and not a choice.

Some employers seemed to feel that Latino farmworkers may not fully understand Canada's stricter OHS regulations and stronger workplace safety culture. This Canadian emphasis on safety

may be, in part, a result of having a publically funded universal health care system. Regulations are developed and enforced in part to avoid the high healthcare costs caused by injuries and higher workers' compensation premiums for industries and enterprises that amass a poor track record with respect to claims for workplace injuries and deaths. My findings align with those of Narushima and Sanchez (2014) who found that Ontario employers of migrant farmworkers were interested in finding ways to bridge the cultural gaps with respect to safety. Like Narushima and Sanchez (2014), I heard that there was a felt need for help from bilingual members of the local Latino community who have more formal education. Some of the Saskatchewan employers interviewed felt that members of the migrant worker support group could also help them with modifying certain cultural beliefs of the workers. Of course, to what degree employers would be willing to pay for such assistance and how it could be integrated into the work week are questions that still remain to be answered.

Members of the migrant worker support group in Saskatchewan observed that (male and female) migrant farmworkers are in need of more preparation, including more health and safety information, before arriving in Canada. It is important to note that Mexican farmworkers participating in the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) are provided with pre-departure information and/or orientation sessions that are delivered mainly by the Ministry of Labour in Mexico City. The volunteer support group members with whom I spoke feel that such preparation should not only be on workplace-related health and safety matters, but also on interpersonal relations/skills such as how to maintain good relationships with coworkers (both Latino and Canadian) and with employers. The two interviewees from the migrant worker support group argued that it would be helpful if there was more trust and camaraderie among Latino farmworkers.[21] However, this is not equally an issue at all agricultural workplaces. Several of the Latina women I spoke with suggested that, despite occasional disputes and arguments, they have developed a strong sense of solidarity that becomes particularly evident when any of them are experiencing a difficult time. More than one woman said, *"Nos damos*

[21] It is important to acknowledge that in addition to the stresses they face and any cultural or personality factors, these workers frequently come from different regions, that the communities they come from may be far from entirely harmonious, that corruption and the threat of violence are quotidian experiences for many of them, and that the temporary migrant labour system involves competition for the relatively few jobs available.

ánimo entre nosotras," we encourage each other. This parallels the findings of Preibisch and Encalada (2010) who studied Mexican women working on farms in Ontario.

In the pre-departure information/orientation sessions mentioned above, Mexican farmworkers are introduced to some fundamentals of work-related safety practices, general health care, and employer-employee relations. However, more research is needed to learn about delivery modalities, and about the substance and tone of these pre-departure sessions. When asked, Mexican workers did not volunteer much detail about these sessions and showed almost no interest in talking about them. If anything, the women who were interviewed seemed to be even less interested in commenting on the details of the pre-departure information sessions in Mexico City. From what I can gather, neither the men nor the women found these sessions to be very informative, helpful, or memorable. Whatever the strengths or limitations of these sessions, unlike the Mexican farmworkers participating in the SAWP, Nicaraguan farmworkers participating in the Agricultural Stream (AS) program are not provided with any such (governmental) pre-departure information/orientation sessions. Several Nicaraguan farmworkers I interviewed were aware that their Mexican counterparts attended such sessions and regretted that they had had no such opportunity; they felt that this would perhaps have helped them to be better prepared to face the challenges of a new work environment.

5.4. Theme 3: Work Organization and Workplace Culture as Factors Complicating Access to English Language Learning

Sub-theme: Worker Interest in Learning English. The farmworkers who participated in this study generally rated the acquisition of better English language skills as their "most urgent" learning need. This finding coincides with the results of other research conducted in Canada (McLaughlin, 2009) and the USA (Perilla et al., 1998; Arcury et al., 2010). In interviews conducted with Latino migrant farmworkers in Georgia, Julia Perilla and co-researchers (1998) found that learning English was the workers' most important (learning) priority, and they concluded that the workers had "a general awareness of the power of being able to communicate in English and the inherent advantages of being bilingual" (p. 260). Various social actors and organizations in the larger Saskatchewan community are (and could be) important providers of language training and other support for migrant farmworkers. The migrant farmworkers interviewed have access to some

community resources to help them to adjust to Canada and to learn things that they need or want to know. For example, non-formal English classes are provided free-of-charge by volunteers from the migrant worker support group, by other NGOs, and by churches. Local churches are also a valuable resource for migrant workers; they often find social and spiritual support through attending services and programs. Employers who participated in this study were interested in seeing their employees learn more English. Some provided transportation so that the workers could attend classes and others provided learning materials such as DVDs and CDs to be used on the farm computer (though many workers would also need an orientation on how to use a computer).

Several volunteers that I interviewed commented that they are happy to continue volunteering and that they believe there are more people who would be interested in teaching English to migrant farmworkers at no cost. These volunteers have been essential to the temporary foreign worker program because they reduce costs for employers and for the labour-sending and labour-receiving governments/jurisdictions. At a Saskatchewan-based NGO, I informally met several Canadians wanting to volunteer to teach English to Latino migrant farmworkers; many were young people pursuing their bachelor degrees, and others were retired professionals and seniors who wanted to learn about other cultures while also helping others. However, it seemed that many or most Latino migrant farmworkers are not aware of these language services or that they are available free-of-charge. Volunteers, NGOs, employers, and other stakeholders need to find better ways to collaborate to implement a more coordinated outreach program to address farmworker needs. They especially need to find ways to provide more language training, information related to staying healthy and accessing healthcare services, and general education about Canadian regions, society, culture, human rights, and law. There may be a role for a new social economy organization, perhaps a multi-stakeholder co-operative that could provide a forum for exchanging ideas and information as well as a venue for coordination and collaboration. In this connection, it is interesting that the National Farmers Union based in Saskatoon now has a committee focusing on issues around employment of migrant farmworkers.

In general, I found that the farmworkers I interviewed wanted to learn English and had made some efforts to learn the language. Almost every worker I interviewed had purchased English

language learning materials (dictionaries, DVDs, grammar workbooks, and grammar booklets), either in their home country, in Saskatchewan, or elsewhere in Canada. They used these materials to study when they had the time and energy. However, they rarely found the time to study. Several workers commented ironically that "*Solo traje a pasear mis libros,*" or literally, "I only came to tour around my books," by which they meant that they brought the books all the way to Canada but barely used them. Based on migrant worker and employer reports, Latino migrant farmworkers show more interest in learning materials that include video and audio (multimedia) such as DVDs and CDs. However, many of them still lack computer skills. This finding is in harmony with the research of Courville, Wadsworth, and Schenker (2016) who found that farmworkers tend to prefer videos over printed learning materials for learning about workplace safety and related matters.

Despite their interest, there are various reasons why Latino migrant farmworkers are not more engaged in English language learning. Although the workers considered improving their language skills to be important, and this was likewise seen by other stakeholders to be a high priority, learning a second language is a lengthy, time-consuming process. Furthermore, low levels of formal education may make many Latino farmworkers hesitant about enrolling in English language classes and may also make learning in such formal classes more difficult for them. Learning a language from written materials can be challenging especially with respect to learning correct pronunciation. While they may become a little familiar with certain written components, speaking and listening skills are what these workers need most urgently. Generic English textbooks do not focus on the communication needs of migrant workers—the vocabulary and language skills they need for their work and for off-site interactions. Furthermore, attending weekend classes is often difficult. In addition to the transportation issues that they face, they are usually tired, need to attend to housekeeping tasks, or may have to work a Saturday shift. Saturday evenings and Sundays were also important for resting and/or attending church. It seemed that the farmworkers that were interviewed may also be dissuaded from pursuing English classes because of perceptions (well-founded or not) that learning an additional language is a difficult and expensive process. Additionally, Latino migrant farmworkers may surmise that, even if they become fairly proficient, learning English may not translate into more job security or to accessing a better hourly wage.

Although virtually all the migrant farmworkers interviewed rated the acquisition of better English language skills as a high priority, bilingual interpreters are still needed to help bridge the language gaps between workers and employers. Learning a second language takes time, and time is something that workers lack. Furthermore, most employers do not have adequate fluency in Spanish and have not found it possible to improve their language skills. Ideally, bilingual interpreters could also act as language instructors for farmworkers and employers in the workplace, and provide orientation on how to use multimedia materials such as DVDs which seem to be a preferred learning medium for workers.

Sub-theme: Hourly-based Contracts as Barriers to Learning. Most of the study participants—and especially the workers—appeared to share the view that the hourly-based arrangement for employment was the most important factor limiting their ability (and willingness) to devote time to learning English or to other learning activities. Latino migrant farmworkers were aware that learning English was important to their wellbeing while working in Canada. However, the workers also recognized that the only time that they really needed the capacity to communicate in English was when they are in Canada. As was also documented by McLaughlin (2009) in her doctoral research in Ontario, the migrant workers did not see themselves as having much use for English in their home countries. Consequently, despite awareness that being able to speak English is advantageous when working in Canada, they likely thought that it was not worth the required investment of time, effort, and money. They may have felt discouraged about studying English given that the trade-offs were significant and that future employment in an Anglophone milieu was uncertain and probably unlikely. In the end, their fundamental priority was to obtain as many hours of paid work as they could in order to maximize their earnings while abroad.

According to the migrant farmworkers and to the members of the migrant worker support group who were also interviewed, irregular work schedules and travel distances frequently limited their ability to participate in English classes or other educational opportunities. This was particularly true for weekdays i.e., Monday to Friday, but there were also constraints on the weekends. On Saturdays, workers usually work until noon or until two in the afternoon. Sundays are typically reserved for resting, doing errands, grocery shopping, watching TV, and attending church. Although workers considered learning English to be important, working as much as possible was

their foremost priority. Many workers, both male and female, strongly expressed the perspective that "*Nosotros venimos a trabajar,*" or "we come to work." Their purpose in coming to Canada on a temporary-seasonal basis was to improve their household economy and their home, to defray costs associated with their children's education, and perhaps also to be able to invest in a new business in their home communities. The seriousness and urgency of such goals were expressed eloquently in their facial expressions and body language. For many of the interviewed workers, the prospect of perhaps being able to start their own business was important as they hoped to eventually leave the temporary foreign employment program and to stay in their home communities with their families. In the meantime, these workers said they came to Canada "*Por la necesidad,*" out of necessity and solely because of their need to overcome economic difficulties. Despite recognizing the desirability of learning English, it was not their highest priority.

Workers send remittances to their home countries in order to make improvements in their homes/living arrangements, provide for the daily needs of family members, and to invest in family business and/or save for future entrepreneurial activities. Most of their partners/wives/husbands who remain in Mexico or Nicaragua also take on jobs outside their homes in order to support the household. This is in addition to domestic chores and, in some cases, small-scale agricultural activities. Given that all or almost all the interviewed Latino farmworkers seemed to have businesses underway, or at least plans for starting a business, in their home communities, they were understandably less focused in the possibility of immigrating to Canada. Examples of lines of the businesses in which they operate, or plan to operate, include small stores[22], agricultural/beekeeping activities, beauty salons, dressmaking shops, and party/event organization. For many, the money and time invested in home country business would be wasted if they immigrated to Canada. They also understand that the barriers to migrating to Canada are high, that it is at best a difficult, expensive, and drawn-out process even if one is willing to make the sacrifices that would be involved.

It is worth mentioning that, for the most part, the workers did not seem to have developed strong ties with host communities in Saskatchewan; they identify themselves as foreigners and, more

[22] Known as *tienda* or *tendajón* in Mexico and *pulpería* in Nicaragua.

importantly, their strong social connections are in Mexico or Nicaragua. The interviewed Latino farmworkers miss their home countries: they expressed emotions and told stories that relate back to their countries of origin. While in Canada, they try to meet and socialize with people that share the same culture and language. This is in alignment with the findings of Zachrison (2014) regarding the migration experiences of foreign/migrant workers in Sweden. In fact, it is a common experience of both temporary and many long-term/permanent migrants but would seem to be a natural reaction especially for people who feel like outsiders, lack facility in the locally spoken language, and have very limited prospects for settling and gaining citizenship status for themselves and for other family members.

Despite the difficult economic conditions and other local problems, it is seen as desirable to return to Mexico or Nicaragua considering that that is where their loved ones and friends are, where they find the food they like, where weather conditions are more familiar and less challenging, where they have started or have the possibility of starting their own (small) business, and, of course, where they can speak their own language and feel at home in the culture. In fact, many of the workers openly stated that their family members are not interested in moving to Canada. These family members usually cannot speak English but, most importantly, like themselves, these family members have strong social and cultural ties to Mexico or Nicaragua. It seems that the interviewed Latino migrant farmworkers had not developed much of a sense of belonging in relation to any Saskatchewan communities with which they interacted. When I asked (as an extra question) what they miss the most when they go back to Mexico or Nicaragua, the majority answered: "*¡Los dólares!*" (the dollars!) or "*¡Nuestros salarios!*" (our [Canadian] wages!).

Understandably, migrant farmworkers feel that they are needed back in their countries of origin. While participation in foreign labour programs helps them to address individual economic constraints, this arrangement typically puts significant strains on families. It leaves children without a parent and spouses without a partner, and creates other gaps in the fabric of kinship and community networks. These workers know that they are making a sacrifice and that there are costs borne by other family members as well. However, it is also important to mention that what makes the migrant workers feel happier and more encouraged about the situation is to see that

their loved ones are benefitting from the remittances sent from Canada. When the migrant farmworkers return to Mexico or Nicaragua and witness some of the positive changes that their families are experiencing due to an improved household economy, this contributes to their own feeling of wellbeing and helps them to see the separation and hardships as acceptable. Again, the focus on providing for families left at home tends to put their own educational aspirations on the back burner. The whole structure of the work arrangement and their separation from family makes workers less interested in self-improvement or in taking unremunerated time out for OHS or other training.

With respect to taking time to learn English or for other educational projects, one of the most important factors is a strong commitment to work and putting in as many hours as possible on the job. Structural conditions, economic incentives, social concerns, psychological factors, and cultural and personal factors all help to explain the 'work ethic' of Latino migrant farmworkers. They recognize that increased income translates into greater wellbeing for their families as well as opportunities to invest in both personal and community projects such as improvements to churches, playgrounds, schools, or other shared facilities. Wages for farmworkers or day labourers in Mexico and Nicaragua are significantly lower than minimum wages in Saskatchewan.[23] They also work hard because they recognize that they have limited years to participate in this type of hard manual labor before their bodies start to weaken or break down. In addition, some workers may work as many hours as possible in order to distract themselves from their worries, sense of social isolation, and homesickness. This was noted particularly among the female farmworkers interviewed. Presumably, working occasionally to the point of exhaustion also promotes sleeping without waking to mull over worries that they may have with respect to their families at home.

An average number of hours per week worked by the migrant farmworkers was not estimated due incomplete data—and anyway averages can be misleading. The workers commented that each work/agricultural season is different. The workers may work for several weeks in a row and then

[23] In 2015, the applicable minimum wage in Saskatchewan was CAD$10.50 per hour. The (typical) wage in many agricultural regions of Mexico was $120 Pesos (CAD$9.70) for an eight-hour work day, and $106 Córdobas (CAD$5.13) for an eight-hour work day in Nicaragua. Actual wages in Mexico and Nicaragua likely vary across regions.

have no work for one, two, or even three weeks in a row. Work tasks, and therefore hours of work depend on factors such as type and diversity of commodities produced, production cycles and crop characteristics, weather conditions, farm characteristics, marketing schedules, and labour management styles. A typical issue in agricultural labour management is the peaked character of labour demand at certain periods of the growing season—e.g. planting and harvesting, for example. At other times and in other seasons, the need for labour is low unless one is dealing with relatively continuous production as in an industrial hog operation or a mushroom growing enterprise. It is the existence of such uneven labour demand that makes flexible labour regimes more attractive, necessary, and competitive. Several workers reported that when they were working, typical work days would range from four to 12 hours.

Honey production is very different from greenhouse vegetable production. Farming systems are shaped by many different factors that affect the work of workers and their employers. Due to differences in local conditions, management approaches, and availability of family labour, for example, even farms producing the same commodity/crop may have very different work schedules for their migrant farmworker employees. For the same wide range of reasons, and because supervisory styles and employer personality and temperament also matter, OHS circumstances and experiences can also vary a great deal between superficially similar operations. In workplaces where Latino migrant farmworkers are employed, hazards and risks likewise vary because of different kinds of equipment and machinery in use, different approaches to maintaining this technology, and different approaches to general and OHS education and training.

Latino workers are valued in Canada in part because of their reliability and strong ‘work ethic.’ To understand the attitudes and worldviews of Latino farmworkers, it is important to consider the historical roots of this willingness to work hard under difficult circumstances. Spanish colonization followed by more recent forms of oppression and exploitation in the countryside has helped to turn many Latino workers into relatively docile and deferential people who recognize that they have few possibilities to influence their circumstances. Given a lack of options and opportunities locally, together with ongoing social and economic inequalities, agriculture workers in many parts of Latin America have become part of a cheap, readily available, international

labour pool. The temporary foreign worker phenomenon can be understood as a legacy of colonialism and neo-colonialism, and as a manifestation of the same urge to exploit the labour of people with less bargaining power in the context of contemporary neoliberal globalization. It is also a perverse aspect of the new international division of labour in which poorer countries find it expedient to export workers to take up employment in richer countries—albeit doing low-wage, menial tasks in sectors that are not attractive to the local workforce. In this context, and given that their immediate concern is to make some money, Latino migrant farmworkers are eager to work on almost any schedule and for as many hours as their employers are able to provide (Basok, 2002; Binford, 2013).

It is important to note that, although these workers are eager to work many hours, this does not necessarily mean that they are always eager to work long hours without a real break. Many of the interviewed Latino farmworkers did not like it when they had to work for up to, for example, 13 hours per day for two or three days in a row, after which they might be idle for one or two weeks awaiting new assignments. Instead, workers desire a scenario where their hours of work are much more evenly distributed across six days of the week. Higher wages would also contribute to the wellbeing of migrant—and local/domestic—farmworkers. However, unlike the local farmworkers, Latino migrant temporary farmworkers need to make their stay in Canada worthwhile so that family separation and other sacrifices are compensated. In other words, not being at home with their loved ones must pay off. Based on minimum wage compensation, these workers would prefer an employment contract where they work (the equivalent of) eight or ten hours a day for five or six days per week, for a minimum of six months. In their view, anything less makes it hard to justify the sacrifices, stresses, costs, and risks involved. Of course, the prospects of such a contract are slim to nil. For reasons already discussed, agricultural employers would not be amenable to such a regime. On the other hand, the interests of migrant farmworkers could be partially accommodated by putting some additional payment/hour guarantees in their contracts so they do not absorb so much of the risk associated with seasonal variability and other unpredictable conditions.

To recap, the interviewed farmworkers felt that improved arrangements with respect to hours of work and wages would allow them to significantly improve their lives and their family's lives.

Farmer-employers have their own culture of work as well. The orientation to working as hard and as long as necessary to complete time-sensitive tasks is a shared ethic of farmers in many parts of the world. As noted by several Latino migrant farmworkers and employers, weather conditions are a key factor in determining the amount of work available or required and, therefore, the schedules of both farmworkers and employers. Obviously, weather variability is something that cannot be controlled and much of the agricultural sector is vulnerable to such uncertain conditions. Indeed, weather variability, and especially the risk of an early fall (or late spring) and frost, tends to make employers particularly stressed about potential production losses.[24]

Despite some of the deeper systemic concerns and critiques shared above, and despite occasional problematic events, the workplace cultures of the Saskatchewan farms participating in this study seemed to be generally positive. Employers and employees seemed to treat each other with a fair degree of respect. The employers were aware of some of the social and psychological pressures faced by the workers, and of the economic challenges that confronted them at home. As was likewise documented by Binford (2013) in Ontario, some of these employers had even made personal loans to certain workers.[25] Also echoing research findings from Ontario (Binford, 2013), some Saskatchewan employers had visited specific workers in their home countries, touring around their communities in Mexico or Nicaragua.

Employers who had made such trips seemed to appreciate and remember them as something special. The Latino workers involved also reported enjoying these visits and the chance to share aspects of their personal lives and histories with their employers. Regardless of the quality of the pronunciation, the workers who were interviewed also appreciated that their employers generally learned their names. The information sharing happened in both directions. Workers got a pretty good sense of the living circumstances of their employers, and some workers were informed by their employers about selected aspects of the financial circumstances of the enterprise. Such information sharing may be both a building block and an indicator of the bonds of friendship,

[24] Work availability and urgency in these subsectors is strongly dependent on natural phenomena such as short growing seasons, unpredictable weather, and the time required for certain biological processes, e.g. the maturation of fruit. Nevertheless, the fact that employers are under no obligation to pay workers when they are idle means that there is no great pressure to try to smooth the peaks and troughs of work hours.
[25] Personal loans could also be seen as part of a paternalistic labour arrangement.

trust, and co-operation that can develop between groups of people who do not share the same culture or all the same objective interests.

To better understand workplace cultures and the impacts of particular conditions of employment, it is necessary to revisit and analyze the bigger context, i.e. international labour markets in agriculture. Several scholars have noted that the temporary foreign worker programs operating in North American agriculture were designed to promote access to affordable and flexible pools of labour, with the migrant farmworkers having little or no opportunity to participate in decision making at any point in the design and operation of such programs (McLaughlin, 2009; Preibisch, 2011; Hennebry, 2012; Binford, 2013; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). Permanent residence options or other paths to regularization of one's presence in Canada or the USA are nonexistent or rare (McLaughlin, 2009; Binford 2013; Preibisch & Otero, 2014). The programs were designed to grant employers the ability to decide whether and when to terminate or continue worker contracts (Binford, 2013). Many Saskatchewan employment standards (e.g., such as overtime pay, the right to organize, and hours of work) generally do not apply to the agricultural sector, and particularly not to these migrant workers. However, especially when it comes to entering and leaving these program(s), the rules of temporary foreign worker programs and contracts are strictly enforced.

The economic and political characteristics of international labour markets, and particularly the employment contracts that govern their participation, contribute to making migrant farmworkers more compliant (Preibisch, 2012). Compounding the above conditions and legal restrictions, language barriers also make it difficult for the migrant farmworkers to establish communication when it comes to seeking support or guidance from governments or even from non-governmental agencies and organizations. Overall, the situation produces workers who often do not or cannot advocate for themselves for fear of causing problems that could endanger renewal or extension of their contracts. These migrant farmworkers are economically valuable for employers who have come to rely on this reliable, and flexible labour force. They are also important to regional economies especially in locales where migrant labour-employing enterprises are concentrated. Unfortunately for the migrant farmworkers, the pain of political and economic powerlessness, family separation, and social isolation is not conducive to negotiating better terms and conditions of employment nor to studying, learning, or developing new, healthier habits.

5.5. Chapter Summary

This chapter primarily addresses the second research question: What are the implications of related interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts (or circumstances) for farmworker OHS education and training? The discussion and analysis focused on study themes and sub-themes, and on the aforementioned contexts. The main themes examined were: 1) Language barriers as factors in workplace communication and workplace tension, 2) Attitudes towards OHS learning and practices, and 3) Work organization and workplace cultures as factors complicating access to English language learning.

Theme one, language barriers as factors in workplace communication and workplace tension, was the most prominent theme of this study and gave rise observations that were divided into three sub-themes: 1) Awareness of communication limitations, 2) Alternative communication strategies, and 3) Exacerbated health and safety risks. Virtually all the participants were aware of the problems caused by (English and Spanish) language barriers and identified language barriers as the major challenge for workplace and off-site communications. On top of the physical and social isolation that workers frequently experienced because they lived on farms that were located quite far from urban centers, language barriers also contributed to further isolation within the workplace and in nearby communities. Although language barriers do not affect employers to the same degree, employers also identified language barriers as the most important challenge when it comes to interacting with Latino migrant farmworkers. Indeed, language barriers were also acknowledged to contribute to unwanted social barriers in the workplace.

Those workers who can communicate with at least broken English frequently become informal supervisors of other Latino workers. This arrangement can contribute to stress and alienation among the workers. Unaddressed language barriers encourage the practice of using broken English and/or Spanish, as well as hand signals, to communicate important instructions and safety advice in the workplace. Moreover, most of the interviewed farmworkers seemed to have come to see language barriers and related communications problems as a normal component of the international labour system in which they participate.

Beyond incomplete understandings, misunderstandings, or miscommunications, language barriers also have the potential to exacerbate health and safety risks faced by both migrant and local personnel (family members and locally hired staff). For farmworkers, these are mainly workplace risks with potential (short- and long-term) impacts on physical health. However, language barriers also prevented many of the interviewed farmworkers from establishing reliable communications with medical personnel when they needed to visit a doctor. Serving as interpreters in workplaces, clinics, and other important venues, bilingual civil society/social economy organization volunteers played crucial (and largely invisible) roles helping migrant farmworkers and their employers to bridge communication gaps. In sum, however, the subordinate status of migrant farmworkers is rendered more acute by being dependent on others who can communicate in English and/or Spanish. For these temporary workers, language barriers become important social determinants of both occupational health and safety, and general health and wellbeing.

Theme two, attitudes towards OHS learning and practices, includes one sub-theme that deals mainly with certain habits and personal beliefs that some of the interviewed farmworkers identified as potentially disadvantageous or dangerous. Among other things, they did not always see following occupational health and safety protocols as taught in their workplaces as practical, necessary, or a high priority. This topic is complex because such worker perceptions are not only related to personal beliefs and preexisting work habits. The poor quality of certain personal protective gear and the need to maintain a fast work pace may combine with preexisting attitudes and habits to discourage workers from implementing occupational health and safety practices. Ultimately, farmworkers and employers are immersed in work processes where economic, agronomic, and weather concerns sometimes put pressure on both parties to privilege task completion over rigorous implementation of all recommended health and safety protocols. Interestingly, and despite any such lapses, the interviewed farmworkers believe that, thanks to the years of coming to Canada to work, they have been able to observe and absorb some safety habits practiced by their employers and supervisors, and by Canadian and Latino coworkers.

Theme three, work organization and workplace culture as factors complicating access to English language learning, broke down into two sub-themes: 1) Worker interest in learning English, and

2) Hourly-based contracts as barriers to learning. In general, the overwhelming majority of interviewed farmworkers felt that learning English is their most pressing learning need. Indeed, being able to understand and to speak more English would significantly reduce workplace and community communications problems, and it would be empowering for farmworkers who are able to do so. It is important to recognize that some efforts have been made by migrant farmworkers and employers to learn basic English and basic Spanish respectively. Many farmworkers have purchased English language learning resources and some employers have provided additional learning materials and/or transportation to attend classes. However, several factors discourage workers from engaging in English language classes. These include low levels of formal education, learning materials and modalities that are not tailored to their contexts and circumstances, the lengthy process of language acquisition, and unpredictable and intense work schedules. Another important factor is that taking time to learn speak English does not readily translate into higher hourly wages or any improvement in their employment prospects. The temporary nature of their contracts entails uncertainties. The contracts do not guarantee that workers will be able to work for an entire agricultural season or for additional seasons in future years. Therefore, for many workers, devoting time and resources to learning English seems a low priority, or perhaps even pointless. Not surprisingly, the hourly-based contract was also identified as an important limiting factor by many of the workers who participated in these interviews.

Hourly-based contracts—along with agronomic factors and weather conditions—contribute to the irregular and erratic character of work schedules that prevent workers from making any commitment to attend English language classes on a regular basis. Worker interest in maximizing paid work hours was revealed to be another important obstacle. Overall, it was perhaps the most important reason that they did not follow through on their stated interest in studying English. Ultimately, workers come to Canada for economic reasons, not to learn a new language or other new skills. They are highly motivated, even driven, by economic need and by the sense that they must make money to offset the sacrifices that they and their families are making so that they can work in Canada. It is important to note, moreover, that as farmers and farm labourers, these are people with a strong work ethic already built-in. They share with their Canadian farmer-employers an outlook and a culture that celebrates hard work. For both groups, the ability to perform such work is at the heart of personal identities.

Short seasons and weather variability in Saskatchewan make agricultural enterprises highly vulnerable to economic losses. The rapid passage of the growing season and unpredictable weather conditions also help to enforce a fast work pace while making it difficult to set regular schedules for the workers or their employers. Historical circumstances, such as Spanish colonization and high levels of social and economic inequality in the Mexican and Nicaraguan countryside, combine with the characteristics of contemporary international labour regimes under neoliberal globalization to help subordinate these workers and to render them more deferential.

The use of a socioecological framework and lens helped to support a deeper investigation into the challenges that Latino migrant farmworkers face with respect to learning OHS principles and protocols, and with respect to the practical application of OHS in real existing agricultural workplaces. The framework directed attention to the need to examine the aforementioned challenges in their relevant interpersonal-organizational, community level, and institutional-public policy contexts. Overall, this framework contributed to a better understanding of the factors that shape the experiences of Latino migrant farmworkers and employers with respect to participation in temporary foreign worker programs in the Canadian agricultural sector, and with respect to both general occupational health and safety and OHS education and training.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. Conclusions

The overall purposes of this study are to describe the major challenges pertaining to Latino migrant farmworker OHS education and training, to explore the implications of these challenges, and to understand the relevant social contexts (interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy) that add specificity and complexity to the aforementioned challenges. In this chapter, I conclude by revisiting the research questions presented at the beginning of the dissertation. The first two questions are addressed and further discussed in the conclusions section, and the third question is considered at greater length in the recommendations section.

Research Question 1: What are the major challenges that farmworkers encounter when it comes to learning how to protect their health and work safely, and, particularly, what are the lived experiences of farmworkers with respect to those challenges?

With respect to OHS education and training for Latino migrant farmworkers, the major challenges that surfaced in the course of this investigation are language barriers and cultural differences that add complexity to communications and exchanges of all kinds. In general, both workers and employers are aware of at least some of their own limitations when it comes to intercultural communications and both groups identified language barriers as the major challenge for all organizational/enterprise interactions. Workers and employers each use diverse communication strategies. However, both groups acknowledged that these strategies are frequently insufficient/lacking. With respect to workplace safety practices, the workers and employers interviewed for this study frequently had divergent ideas and perspectives that reflected their specific situations and their immersion in different cultures.

Language barriers and cultural differences have significant implications. Many important messages cannot be transmitted effectively between workers and their employers, or between workers and other important actors such as civil servants with OHS responsibilities and medical personnel. Language barriers limit the efficacy of both verbal and written communications in the workplace and in other venues, e.g. in the local community and in offsite OHS training sessions.

These language barriers prevent stakeholders from effectively sharing instructions, questions, concerns, ideas, and insights that are important for the wellbeing of the enterprise and for everyone working there. Language barriers exacerbate health and safety risks that potentially affect local as well as foreign personnel.

Language barriers can also contribute to mental health problems for workers, as they create stresses, frustrations, and worries. Such stresses and worries come on top of the challenge of coping with family separation and social isolation. Almost all of the interviewed Latino farmworkers admitted that they felt stressed but also that they were resigned to having to deal with the presence of language barriers while working in Canada. Language barriers persist, as important problems despite the efforts made by many workers to learn basic English and the efforts made by many employers to learn some Spanish. The workers resign themselves to the persistence of language barriers because they realize that they lack effective collective representation or the political power to demand more interpreters or English language classes that better fit their working schedules. Limited time, the need for rest, access issues, economic constraints, the design of training materials and programs, and low levels of education can all discourage workers from enthusiastically committing to English language classes (and/or other learning initiatives).

Cultural factors also emerged as barriers to occupational health and safety. Some cultural characteristics and orientations of workers and of employers interact and combine in ways that can be detrimental to the OHS of both parties. On the side of the workers, pre-existing attitudes and habits are compounded by the drive to obtain as many hours of work as possible while in Canada. Their willingness to work long days resonates with the work orientation of the employers who also need workers who will put timely task completion ahead of their own comfort and bodily needs, and occasionally even ahead of their own health and safety. Some Latino farmworkers acknowledged that certain earlier-established habits do not contribute positively to workplace health and safety. In some cases, workers made it clear that they were conscious that they ought to change some of their less safe work habits. In general, however, workers regard their previously acquired skills and attitudes as tools that help them to work

quickly and efficiently even when there are certain hazards involved and despite the fact that they may not receive detailed instructions.

After every work contract in Canada, they return to home communities and local workplaces where they are exposed to beliefs and attitudes that tend to ignore or downplay the ways that work practices can expose a person to cumulative or acute health risks. Of course, this is not the only reason that farmworkers may cut corners or forgo safety gear. It is true that migrant farmworker habits and beliefs are deeply rooted in their experiences in home-country milieus where certain work practices considered unsafe in Canada may not be seen as particularly risky or unacceptable. However, although accident and injury avoidance is a more frequently stated concern in Canadian workplaces, it should be recognized that these workplaces also share cultures of production and productivity that do not necessarily prioritize the systematic and methodical implementation of OHS practices.

The work habits and priorities of these workers are reinforced by their engagement in (international) labour markets where hourly-based contracts are the basis for remuneration and job security is far from assured. As a result, these workers tend to work fast and for as many hours as possible, sometimes to the point of exhaustion. This increases their exposure to health and safety risks. The reality of the business of agriculture in Canada is that farmers typically must work very hard within the span of a short growing season and that they face many challenges to produce the volume and quality of agricultural commodities needed to turn a profit. Thus, the workplace culture is also one that encourages workers to put in long hours and to work as quickly as possible. Working long hours and fast as possible become accepted characteristics of Canadian farm work—for employers as well as employees. Farmworkers are immersed in a workplace milieu that prioritizes work to the extent that they may not have the time or energy to learn enough English to fully understand workplace orientations or occupational health and safety training.

Often they also do not really have the opportunity to absorb Canadian standards regarding workplace safety—the messages they receive are frequently muted and mixed, and they themselves are focused on the fact that the Canadian sojourn is likely to be a time-limited

engagement. In summary, the culture of the workers and the workplace can combine to put the health and safety of migrant workers—and of local/domestic personnel—at risk. Conventional approaches to agricultural OHS education and training that focus narrowly on information transfer and skills development are typically not well adapted to the needs and learning styles of migrant farmworkers. Along the same lines, training content that focuses narrowly on medical topics (e.g., disease or injury) or highly technical subjects (e.g., workplace risk assessment and hazard recognition) are not likely to engage and to adequately address the needs of the migrant farmworkers or their employers.

Preparing migrant farmworkers adequately will require alternative approaches to the design and delivery of linguistically and culturally appropriate education and training. Certain progressive adult education frameworks hold promise for addressing problems of disempowerment and the challenges of language barriers and cultural differences. The philosophy behind such adult education frameworks is to help workers to become informed and active partners who are better equipped to influence decision making and to promote safer work environments. Adult education approaches would generally aim to provide more information (in Spanish) to enable workers to learn about the rights and responsibilities of both workers and employers (see theoretical framework and Appendix H). Adult education approaches would help workers to become more aware of the possible consequences of normalized practices and bad habits. Furthermore, promoters and practitioners of adult education could help to engage stakeholders such as provincial ministries of education, labour, and agriculture, farm organizations, and other NGOs in these educational initiatives. Many of these organizations already have access to and work with migrant farmworkers so a little encouragement, prodding, and brokering may stimulate the needed innovation and collaboration.

Research Question 2: What are the implications of related interpersonal-organizational, community, and institutional-public policy contexts (or circumstances) for farmworker OHS education and training?

In the context of temporary foreign worker programs in Canadian agriculture, language barriers should be understood as the cumulative result of multiple sociocultural and policy factors.

Language barriers and cultural differences have the greatest impact within the interpersonal-organization context. In other words, communications and relations between and among farmworkers and employers in the workplace are the most directly affected by language issues and cultural dissimilarities.

Conditions of employment that include lack of job security and limited rights with respect to normal employee prerogatives such as changing employers or organizing collectively put Latino migrant farmworkers at a disadvantage when it comes to participating in workplace (or labour program) decision making. These impediments are exacerbated by language barriers and Latino cultures of deference and compliance, as well as by irregular work schedules and the pressures that emanate from employment contracts that base remuneration solely on hours worked. Additionally, a lack of employment opportunities in their home countries make the workers pin their hopes for economic advancement on their Canadian contracts, which ensures their compliance with any and all conditions of employment.

The Saskatchewan workplaces where Latino migrant farmworkers are employed are culturally complex. Canadian farmer-employers have the option of hiring farmworkers from different nationalities, which makes some farms into truly multicultural workplaces. In practice, however, employers rely heavily on Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers because of their availability, their work ethic, and their reputation for being responsible workers. The focus on sourcing workers from Mexico and Nicaragua reflects the long-standing SAWP agreement with Mexico and the tendency for patterns of hiring to get repeated once relationships and a pathway has been established. This confirmed preference for Latino migrants underlines the need for initiatives to make Spanish-English bilingual interpreters more readily available.

Employing workers with different cultural backgrounds can enrich workplaces with new ideas that may enhance production and productivity (or even give rise to new products or processes). However, foreign and local personnel may have several different perceptions of occupational health and safety fundamentals and practices. Moreover, workers from different backgrounds may compete with each other in ways that can be helpful or unhelpful from the perspective of employers—but which are generally not helpful to the workers themselves. Competition between

different ethnic/national groups may increase productivity as workers may want to demonstrate that they are productive/efficient and therefore worthy of being offered employment for the next year. This competition may favor the employer because it leads to extra efforts on the part of the workers. On the other hand, when different groups of workers compete against each other to work at a faster pace, this may be counterproductive in that it increases the likelihood of chronic injuries and the risk of accidents. Competing to work faster and taking associated workplace risks are certainly not situations that are favourable for the workers themselves.

Agricultural employers argue that they need Latino migrant farmworkers in order to ensure the economic viability/sustainability of their enterprises. They also acknowledge that they rely on the generally high quality of work done by the Latinos, their strong work ethic, their reliability and trustworthiness, and their willingness to work long hours and to stand by on call until they are needed. It is difficult to find local workers who are as ready and willing to do this kind of work, and on this kind of schedule. Despite the bureaucracy and the costs involved, employers appreciate having access to this dependable and flexible workforce. Given the high value placed on their work and the importance of this arrangement for Canadian stakeholders (as well as national and local governments in Mexico and Nicaragua), it would seem that there might be several (moral and economic) arguments for trying to effectively address issues that detrimentally impact these workers—including language barriers, labour contracts that reinforce the unequal power of the participants, and unwarranted uncertainty in the workplace.

OHS education and training broadly understood is another important concern that deserves attention. The occupational health and safety training on offer in Canada's agricultural sector is still insufficient and inadequate for both migrant and domestic farmworkers (see McLauhglin, 2009). As mentioned in previous chapters, though there are commonalities and shared issues, OHS hazards and risks are present in different measure and in different form in each agricultural enterprise. This variability reflects different production processes and material circumstances but also human factors, including the attitudes and perspectives of supervising personnel. Improving and instituting needed transformative changes in agricultural OHS education and training in Canada will require stakeholder commitment and collaboration, and additional resources. Effective practices instituted elsewhere, and perhaps in other sectors, should be systematically

studied, adapted, and adopted. At present OHS education and training relies heavily on farmer/employer willingness, capacity, and availability. All farmworkers (migrant and domestic) depend rather too heavily on the whim and preferences of employers with respect to OHS training. In addition to problems related to language barriers, difficult cross-cultural communications, lack of agency, and lack of support, being dependent on employers for OHS training puts the health and safety of migrant farmworkers at greater risk. Indeed, such dependence may be a risk in itself.

Employers have important roles to play but they may be amateurs not professionals in the realm of OHS instruction. Furthermore, their interests are complicated and possibly even contradictory. Farmworkers should have access to skilled, bilingual, professional trainers as well as to well-trained supervisors. It would not be misplaced effort or undue interference to institute mandatory training for any agricultural employer hiring migrant workers. One could also envision a system of peer mentors—experienced farmworkers who receive certification for successfully completing training modules/workshops on OHS.

Returning to the discussion of relevant levels in the socioecological framework of health, the local community is another important context that needs to be considered when providing education and training as well as other supports to migrant farmworkers. Community members and community organizations are important players with the potential to assist workers, employers, and other stakeholders in various ways. Both urban and rural communities can provide volunteers and infrastructure to address language and cultural gaps, and other educational, social, and spiritual needs. The educational needs, of course, are on both sides: local community members also need various kinds of opportunities to learn about the history, culture, and contemporary realities of migrant sending countries and regions.

Local communities provide opportunities for temporary foreign workers to meet other English- and Spanish-speaking people. In the community, migrant workers may find opportunities to socialize, make new friends, exchange information and ideas, and learn from the experiences of others. Such interactions can be educational in the broadest sense but also help to mitigate some of the detrimental effects of family separation. For example, churches, local Latino communities,

and NGOs can provide milieus in which migrant farmworkers can build their own support networks. The same kinds of groups and organizations can potentially help workers and employers with interpretation and translation.

Local Canadian communities have the potential to contribute in multiple ways to the wellbeing and success of migrant workers and their employers. Unfortunately for the workers, however, most do not actually live in such local communities. Rather, they live at the farms where they are employed and many of these farms are quite far removed from the nearest town. While most of the migrant farmworkers save on housing costs by living rent-free at the farms where they work—and employers benefit from a workforce that is always close at hand and effectively on-call—being housed away from local towns and cities contributes to the isolation of Latino farmworkers and to making them relatively invisible in the regions where they labour. Compounding language barriers, geographic isolation and outsider status, lack of education and lack of information about the Canadian context, their social location and subordinate identity as seasonal agricultural workers reduces their capacity to exercise what human and labour code rights they do have—and limits their capacity to negotiate or demand recognition and augmented legal protections.

Beyond local community contexts, various institutions/institutional arrangements and policies play important roles in shaping the experiences of temporary foreign workers. The nature of the contracts and international labour agreements that condition farmworker participation as temporary foreign workers have been discussed at some length above and will be discussed further in the recommendations section below. While they are admitted under federal programs, agriculture, labour, education, and health are all relevant areas of mostly provincial jurisdiction. It appears that at the provincial government level there is a lack of awareness of the situation of these farmworkers, and lack of capacity to provide serious oversight and support. One could be forgiven for thinking that there was a measure of interested disinterest involved. The underfunding of agencies dealing with labour regulations is not a uniquely problem faced by migrant workers, but it has special implications for them.

In terms of health services, the ability to access Canada's public health system is important. Unfortunately, not all health contingencies are covered; there is some evidence that sick or injured workers may be sent back to their home countries after only cursory treatment, and Latino workers face language barriers in clinics and hospitals where there is no regularized provision of trained interpreters/liaison workers. The education and training options available to these migrants are, for the most part, highly informal and under-resourced. Agriculture has a long history for special pleading to be exempted from the normal range of labour code provisions. Hence it should not be surprising that foreign workers are confronted with workplaces where there are few limits on employers and organizing in pursuit of labour interests is discouraged.

Stakeholders from Canada, Mexico, and Nicaragua have co-constructed the institutional arrangements and (un)regulated regime under which migrant workers are recruited, very lightly trained, and put to work on Canadian agricultural enterprises. Without more public scrutiny and a greater role for workers and their supporters, these same stakeholders are likely to perpetuate arrangements and conditions that accentuate OHS risks and undermine the wellbeing of migrant workers. Paradoxically, their active collaboration is also necessary to find better, more humane ways to address the challenges that have been described above.

Personal and interpersonal factors affect workers, employers, and their interactions. Organizational aspects including the nature of the agricultural enterprises involved and the workplace cultures that they reproduce, are also important factors shaping worker experiences, OHS hazards and risks, and possibilities for improvement. Local communities, with their prejudices and fears but also with their array of services and their possibilities for socialization and assistance, are likewise important to migrant worker wellbeing and a key to amelioration of their experiences in Canada. Canadian and international institutional arrangements—labour markets, education systems, and health systems, to name three of the key institutional arenas—combine with the particular and aggregate effects of other government policies and programs to shape the challenges faced by migrant farmworkers and their employers. Policies and related government programs are important for what they do and do not do, and this applies to both the legislation and the regulatory/enforcement effort. There are evident gaps, silences, and

knowledge vacuums. Addressing these gaps requires more research, some careful rethinking, and commitment to reform but also a vision of what is possible, just, and sustainable.

6.2. Additional Recommendations

Research Question 3: What are the options for moving forward on migrant farmworker OHS education and training, and what should be considered in designing such interventions/ programs?

Liaisons. While certainly desirable for any number of reasons, learning an additional language is a lengthy and difficult process. Given the limited prospect that employers and/or workers will become truly bilingual, interpreters should be hired to help bridge linguistic barriers between workers, employers, and other stakeholders. One option is to contract/hire local bilingual individuals each agricultural season to address particular communication needs—e.g. when workers arrive and are initially provided with orientation sessions. However, it is certainly preferable that a bilingual (Spanish/English) professional be permanently available at each workplace. Failing that, it should be an expectation and norm that any enterprise employing Spanish-speaking migrants should have someone on the management side who is capable of communicating in Spanish. Although some workers and other study participants reported that certain employers hired interpretation services at specific junctures, the presence of bilingual personnel is necessary at almost all times because language barriers can be a factor at any moment—in the workplace or when migrant workers seek services off-site. As suggested by McLaughlin (2009) and Mysyk (2009), ideally, interpreters should be certified and have the vocabulary and knowledge necessary to be competent in a farm setting. Even if only one or two Latino migrant farmworkers with minimal English language skills are employed at a given farm, efforts should be made to systematically help the workers with interpretation and with information on where to find more assistance.

The Government of Saskatchewan, the Federal Government, and employers may also want to consider a formula for sharing the cost of hiring bilingual agronomists or agronomy students to work alongside Latino migrant farmworkers. Agronomists are proposed because of their

preparation in agricultural matters; however, other professionals with non-agronomy degrees would be suitable as long as they are bilingual. It is recommended that these proposed liaisons be trained in OHS, human/industrial relations, labour management, and human rights. This training would help liaisons, employers, workers, and other program stakeholders to co-create positive and salubrious workplace relations.

The proposed bilingual[26] personnel would need to work and/or live at the farms where the Latino migrant farmworkers work and live, or in the nearest community. They would help address communication gaps at each workplace, participate to some degree in farm work, and teach English *in situ*. The liaisons could also teach Spanish to the employers while working or according to an arranged schedule. They may also act as interpreters (oral communication) and translators (written communication) for farmworkers when the latter needed to access healthcare or other services. If the liaisons possessed specialized knowledge or work experience in areas such as extension, education, and agricultural machinery/equipment operation, this would provide opportunities to plan and implement targeted educational and training interventions. To engage more effectively and to include other stakeholders, such interventions could be implemented through community-based participatory outreach (and research) approaches. With or without the assistance of bilingual liaisons or interpreters, both workers and employers need to find ways to maintain and increase their efforts to learn English and Spanish despite the time constraints.[27] They should pay particular attention to improving speaking and listening skills.

A New Non-Formal Curriculum. In order to design more serviceable curricula and to implement adapted educational and training interventions, those responsible for temporary foreign worker programs in agriculture should consider the kinds of adult education frameworks presented in this dissertation. Regardless of who specifically was involved in providing the education, an English language learning curriculum (or strategy) for workers should include occupational health and safety content so that workers can learn language skills and OHS topics at the same time (in

[26] In English and Spanish, or in French and Spanish if working in rural Quebec.

[27] Employers who could demonstrate that they themselves or someone else working on the farm in a supervisory role were sufficiently proficient in Spanish could be exempted from any requirement to employ a bilingual liaison or interpreter. This would be determined through formal testing and could be an incentive for employers to invest time and effort in learning Spanish. The University of Saskatchewan Language Centre provides courses in Spanish (eight levels from low beginner to advanced).

combination). English language instruction should also include learning materials that reflect the interests and concerns of the Latino migrant farmworkers (e.g. agricultural topics, Canadian society, interpersonal skills, business skills, construction skills, cooking skills, and general health protection). The content should include vocabulary that workers need in their work lives; this will make the learning process more meaningful and relevant to workers, as well as more immediately applicable. Despite limited formal education, migrant farmworkers can learn about many kinds of things as long as facilitators work to promote a participatory form of genuine dialogue.

In addition to this curriculum, bilingual posters should be made available and employers should be required to install them in places where migrant farmworkers are employed and housed. In addition to information about rights and responsibilities of workers and employers, and how to seek assistance with labour issues, posters should provide information about emergency contacts and the location of health service centres. Posters with photographs or (culturally appropriate) drawings would also include information to raise awareness about OHS topics such as safe equipment operation. Additionally, the posters should display a map of the Province of Saskatchewan showing the location and contact information for organizations that provide information and advice for migrant workers along with English as a second language training. It would be useful as well to establish a bilingual hotline where workers could phone if they had an urgent question or were experiencing some kind of a crisis.

The proposed curriculum and learning program could include participation of people from nearby communities. It will be desirable and useful to inform the wider public—particularly the residents of receiving/host communities—about the social conditions and background of Latino migrant farmworkers, and the reasons why they have sought and been granted employment in Canada (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015). NGOs should be lead actors in such community awareness campaigns but local communities also have roles to play in helping migrants with language skills and sharing aspects of the local culture. New training and educational materials designed for farmers, farmworkers, bilingual liaisons, and other audiences should include content about the social/human dimensions of sustainable development in agriculture, albeit in a concise and linguistically and culturally appropriate format. Adult education approaches have much to offer and can be used in combination with other approaches discussed in the second chapter of this

thesis; the training transfer model and the ADDIE principles of instruction: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation of instruction.

Employers should also receive some training in intercultural communications, so that they can better understand worker responses and assess worker needs, for example. Given that farms are typically situated at some distance from urban centres, the possibility of teaching Spanish language skills online to employers should also be investigated. Online teaching methods can be of great help during the winter months when travel is difficult and farmers may be less busy with other tasks. Online modes of instruction, however, may not be equally convenient for all employers. During the interviews, I noticed that not all the farmer-employers were enthusiastic about using computers and online communications. Some of the farmers that I invited to participate in the interviews suggested contacting them via phone or fax because they do not use computers. These farmers tended to be seniors. In addition to programming designed for farmworkers, employers, and local community members, the new curriculum should include material designed for civil servants, especially labour inspectors. They too could benefit from training in Spanish language skills, cross-cultural awareness, intercultural communication, and human rights. These are all foundational in order to better understand and respond to the experiences, needs, and worldviews of Latino (and other) farmworkers.

Policies. In order to offer conditions of employment that more equitably provide advantages and benefits to both workers and employers, policy makers in Canada, Mexico, and Nicaragua need to reconsider the contract arrangements under which migrant farmworkers are hired. Hours-based contracts and minimum wage levels should to be reconsidered. Arrangements for payment should be fair to both sides, and should complement other contract terms that promote the economic and social wellbeing of both parties. It may be useful to convene an expert panel including labour market specialists, human resources managers, civil servants, trade unionists, human rights specialists, economists, and rural sociologists to propose alternatives to the current model of remuneration. One possible way of replacing the purely hours-based model of payment (and removing its problematic health and safety implications) is by paying workers a minimum base pay per weekday, an option that seems more equitable given that the workers are (usually) standing by and available on-call all week. Being available for work on short notice means living

at the worksite and living away from family and friends for many months at a time. Offering some guarantee of paid work hours and work days might reduce some of the pressures that the workers feel both to demonstrate their dedication and proficiency by working especially fast, and to work long hours whenever work is available. The aforementioned approach would also encourage employers to do more to plan and distribute work so that intense working days followed by periods of forced idleness are less frequently the norm. The earlier discussion of social dimensions of agricultural sustainability provides arguments for establishing conditions employment that support the health and wellbeing of all participants. There are reputational and ethical issues at stake. The treatment of temporary foreign workers is under scrutiny globally and domestically, and is a measure of civility, fairness, and justice.

There are other policies that may contribute to achieving mutually beneficial employment conditions. For example, the work permits of farmworkers should be valid for at least five production seasons; this longer term would enable workers and employers to justify devoting time to learning languages and to invest in other initiatives that will improve the social sustainability of agriculture. If the period of these work permits were extended, this would reduce the costs associated with procuring the single-season permit. Along with this extended work permit, employers and employees should be able to make employment agreements that, barring major problems, are valid for up to five years. Such options would add stability and security for both parties, and should be available to those participating in both the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) and the Agricultural Stream (AS).

In addition, as suggested above, post-season health exams should be implemented. These should be done in Canada and the results recorded in both Spanish and English. Like their Mexican counterparts, Nicaraguan migrant farmworkers need to be provided with pre-departure information/preparation sessions. In both Mexico and Nicaragua, these sessions and associated information packages should cover a greater breadth of relevant topics so that they can become more knowledgeable about the Canadian work environment. Elements of the proposed adult education curriculum could be useful for trainers/training in both the Nicaraguan and Mexican context. It would be reasonable for Canadian embassy/consular personnel to be involved in delivering some of this orientation, which could include documentary videos illuminating various

aspects of Canadian society. Of course travel distance could be an impediment given that some of the Latino workers come from small rural towns and villages.

Program participants and overseers should also address problems of isolation and access in the Canadian context by working on transportation issues. It would be reasonable to work towards providing some sort of weekly shuttle service to pick up workers at the farms where they live and to take them to urban centres for shopping and running errands, recreating and socializing, and attending classes. The costs of such transportation services should be shared by various stakeholders in Canada—e.g. provincial ministries of labour and agriculture, businesses offering goods and services to farmworkers, employers, and the workers themselves.[28]

It is also recommended that OHS education and training be provided to all farmworkers (migrant and local) by relevant governmental agencies. Unlike large industrial enterprises, agricultural employers frequently lack the personnel and resources to provide comprehensive OHS education and training to their employees. Moreover, if farmworkers received training from other sources, they would be less dependent on their employer's capacity and willingness to provide OHS training, and would benefit from interacting with an independent third party. It is also important that employers receive agricultural OHS education and training from governmental agencies or from certified providers. Training the trainers is likewise important to ensure that appropriate OHS learning takes place. At the very least, the Government of Saskatchewan should take steps to ensure that bilingual OHS learning materials are provided to farmworkers and employers. Videos in an appropriate selection of languages would be an important first step. It would be logical to involve the Canadian Centre for Healthy and Safety in Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan and it would not be unreasonable to ask agricultural employers to defray part of the cost of these educational initiatives.

[28] The Saskatoon Co-operative Association, for example, has had some sort of shared-cost bus chartering arrangement to facilitate the shopping trips of elders living in various seniors-oriented residential complexes around the city. Of course, casinos often offer similar services for free, and this illustrates some possible downsides of securing commercial sponsorships for farmworker transportation.

Research. It may be useful to establish a pilot research program on several Saskatchewan farms in order to evaluate the impacts of having a professional bilingual liaison available in the workplace. Likewise, it will be useful to involve education students and professors in evaluating efforts to implement a new curriculum that represents pedagogical innovation in terms of delivery modalities and content. It is important to try to better understand the origins and propagation of migrant worker beliefs and habits that may increase health and safety risks both for them and other people working alongside them. Qualitative, in-depth interviews may be the most powerful tool for exploring these issues. The outcomes may be compared with data from paired farms where Latino migrant farmworkers are also employed but do not have access to the assistance of a bilingual professional. In a subsequent, expanded version of this evaluative research, it will be useful to consider questions of the gender, ethnicity and nationality of the bilingual professional as well.

As mentioned in the findings chapter, some (male) farmworkers participating in group the interviews initiated conversation about work habits and beliefs that they worried might be detrimental for workplace health and safety. As these interviews unfolded, the group dynamic facilitated a process of self-reflection in which the workers were able to acknowledge the need for change. Having observed this dynamic, I would recommend having meetings with farmworkers to explore their insights about workplace health and safety. In followup meetings, it would be interesting to learn if they felt that they had modified any of their beliefs, attitudes, or practices with respect to OHS as a result of these opportunities to share views and experiences. As an adjunct to more formal OHS training, such facilitated "reflection circles" should be informal and safe spaces where workers can take part in open and frank discussion without fear of judgement or retribution. These proposed "reflection circles" might be useful to reverse bullying behaviours among male workers and to bring forward more mutually supportive attitudes with regards to wearing protective gear and trying to speak English. While mixed groups may be useful in some circumstances, there may also be an argument for women having their own reflection circles to enrich understandings of work realities that may differ for women including the gendered dimensions of OHS experiences and training needs. This would also avoid possibilities of male domination of these discussions. On the other hand, the presence of

women in such conversation may allow men to hear other perspectives and may temper some of the macho discourse.

A broader perspective on social sustainability in agriculture would call for attention to the diverse impacts of worker migration on those left behind in home communities—particularly partners and children. It is also important to look at how children of both sexes experience the physical absence of their fathers or mothers. What are the costs to these children and what are the social implications of prolonged parental absences? What are the other (negative or positive) social impacts of migration on family members and communities? While some research has been done on such issues, it has rarely been framed as part of an assessment of the social sustainability of Canadian agriculture.

Research is also required to better understand the pedagogical methods and content of OHS education and training currently provided to workers at their workplaces or other locales. With regard to the English language study materials that workers bring with them to Canada (or acquire while in Canada), some research effort should be directed to assessing whether such materials correspond well with the educational goals and capabilities of migrant farmworkers. One goal of such research might be to work towards creating a package of language training materials that specifically addressed and targeted the language learning needs of such workers while simultaneously providing other kinds of highly relevant information as part of the content. The development of such materials could usefully be organized as a participatory action research project in which workers were deeply involved in generating and evaluating elements of this package. Funding for such work might come, in part, from academic research funders and in part from other sources, including employer organizations. It might also be possible to create a similar package aimed at the Spanish language and related learning needs of (prospective and experienced) employers.

As one facet of this research, pre-departure information/orientation sessions provided to Mexican farmworkers by the Mexican Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare should be reviewed to assess and evaluate delivery methods and content. Another more general recommendation coming out of this dissertation is that an interdisciplinary team of Canadian, Mexican, and/or Nicaraguan

researchers should work together to design longer-term research projects addressing, among other things, the educational and training needs of workers and employers. Governments in Canada, Mexico, and Nicaragua should be involved in ways that facilitate interaction and mutual learning. They should consider and initiate equitable ways to provide funding for this and other research that focuses on improving various aspects of migrant worker programs and experiences.

As mentioned above, the gendered experiences of migrant farmworkers need to be studied in detail to better understand the special circumstances associated with being a female or male farmworker. What attitudes come into play? What are the particular health risks and OHS concerns? What kinds of stresses do they have to deal with and how do they cope? In order to capture sufficient data on women's and men's experiences, more field research time interacting with male and female migrant workers is recommended, including conducting participant observation at particular workplaces throughout the length of seasonal contracts. Another possibly useful approach would be to interview farmworkers in their home communities after they have returned from working in Canadian settings. This could be a separate study or could be combined with interviews done with the same people in Saskatchewan. In the latter case, it would be a useful form of revisit (Burawoy, 2003) and would allow the researcher to build more rapport and to delve deeper into some sensitive topics.

6.3. Study Strengths and Limitations

This doctoral study focuses on the experiences of Latino migrant farmworkers and their Canadian employers in three agricultural subsectors in Saskatchewan: beekeeping, vegetable production, and horticultural nurseries. To my knowledge, this study is the first in the province to provide a forum for Latino migrant farmworkers, their employers, OHS civil servants, community volunteers/advocates, and other informed participants. An important strength of this study was that, in most cases, workers and employers from the same workplaces were interviewed. This approach produces data that is richer and deeper in the sense that one is able to learn about the perspectives of social actors who have different standpoints with respect to a shared social space or work context. Although this method was not pursued to the degree that portraits of particular workplaces and workplace practices were developed incorporating the divergent views of actors occupying different structural positions, it did help me to better understand the culturally

mediated interactions of these two sets of social actors. The diverse stakeholder perspectives incorporated into the study helped to broaden and deepen my understanding of the experiences of Latino migrant workers and their employers, elucidate linguistic and cultural differences, and to throw a brighter light on the education and training needs of various participants. To be clear, the study points to educational and training needs not only for workers but also for employers, civil servants with OHS responsibilities, and community members from the host communities.

One of the constraints under which data were collected also turned out to be a source of strength. Given sensitivities and concerns surrounding industrial relations in agriculture, and given concerns raised by the research ethics oversight board at the University of Saskatchewan with respect to (political/social/economic) risks that might be visited on a vulnerable population, I only approached Latino farmworkers about the possibility of conducting formal interviews after first receiving their employer's approval. The employers generally introduced me to the employees and assured them that they (the employers) were okay with the granting of interviews if the workers wished to participate in the study. Some employers even commented to the workers that their (voluntary) participation was important for this study. Most likely, this encouragement from the employers made the workers feel more comfortable talking with me because it assured them that they were not doing anything against the wishes of the employer.

Of course, under this protocol I was unable to gain access to workers whose employers were averse to participation in the study. Additionally, it is very likely that the sample of respondents (both workers and employers) tended to come disproportionately from farms where the employer felt fairly confident about labour relations at the enterprise. Given this sampling and recruitment protocol, along with the constraints of locating willing study participants in general, the sample of enterprise managers who participated was also likely to be skewed towards those who felt positive about the arrangements under which they gain access to Latino farm labourers. The same could be said with respect to their willingness to co-operate with a student researcher who was focusing on the sensitive and challenging area of OHS—exploring worker experiences, perspectives, and training needs. Whatever their reservations may have been, granting an interview and giving me access to their Latino employees and farms likely also signaled a certain level of openness and confidence (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015). Although I did not gather

any data on this aspect, it is possible that they were also fairly favorably disposed toward university researchers and researchers in general.

In total, I conducted eight group interviews and five individual interviews with Latino farmworkers. The group interview format has advantages but also some drawbacks. Anonymity and confidentiality are certainly more of an issue in a group interview setting. Anonymity is not possible and confidentiality is only possible if interviewees promise not to disclose what they hear or see in the group interview. It is also important to note that, especially in group interviews, some workers may have been reticent about speaking out about issues that could potentially lead to repercussions or reprisals should word of complaints or critiques somehow get back to the ears of more powerful social actors—e.g. employers or government bureaucrats responsible for overseeing such labour programs (Viveros-Guzmán & Gertler, 2015).

Also, as is common in group dynamics, each group would have a few talkative participants who contributed substantially to the discussions, and a few participants who did to not talk much at all. Timid and shy workers may have felt inhibited by the already established group dynamics in which certain individuals are acknowledged as leaders or dominant members. Moreover, most of these group interviews were conducted on weekends, during rare time off for the workers and employers. The interviews often took more than and hour, so the participants were undoubtedly tired (I noticed one or two workers nodding off during the group interviews) or thinking about other weekend activities they needed or wanted to take care of.

On the positive side of the ledger, group interviews provide opportunities to expand the depth and breadth of the conversation, with topics undergoing a second or third revisit as different participants weigh in and are stimulated by the contributions of others. Some shy respondents may be encouraged and emboldened by the presence and participation of their peers, a dynamic that can be especially important in less individualistic cultures that favour social interaction and group activities. On the whole, more understanding can be produced in a group interview because one individual may make a point that others may not have considered, but which may be significant and comment-worthy for the entire group. Additionally, participants in collective conversations have the opportunity to compare perspectives and discover shared experiences and

perspectives when discussing and prioritizing needs and considering potential solutions to common challenges.

Furthermore, culturally, Latino people tend to enjoy collective conversations with people who share similar circumstances. Most of the workers seemed comfortable and reasonably confident participating in a group interview rather than being interviewed individually. Moreover, I did not perceive any discomfort from the interviewed women related to the fact that I am male. I felt that female participants were relaxed about my presence in both group and individual interview settings. This was perhaps because I am also Latino, speak the same language, am a student, seem sympathetic and unthreatening, or because they knew that their employer had assented to their participation in the interviews—or some combination of these factors.

Regarding the five one-on-one interviews conducted with individual workers, three of them unfolded very well. The remaining two did not flow as easily because the employers were at home during the interviews. Although the employees lived at a different house, these two farmworkers were visiting at the home of their employer when I interviewed them. As a consequence, these two workers completed their interviews with the intermittent presence of their employers in the background. One result of these inconvenient circumstances was that these two workers (interviewed individually) provided rather short answers and opted not to answer certain questions. This observation is important because it illustrates some of the complicated circumstances one can confront when interviewing a vulnerable population that has little autonomy/independence. I did not feel that I could easily shift these interviews to another venue, however I tried my best to collect as much data as I could without putting any undue pressure on these two farmworkers. Moreover, although the two employers might have overheard some portions of these interviews, only one of these two employers understands any Spanish.

The qualitative approach used in this study allows for more in-depth inquiry and, therefore, a more in-depth understandings of the experiences of this specific group/sample of people. Although the interviews were done with a range of individuals in a range of circumstances, it is not known to what degree the findings are readily generalizable to Latino farmworkers and employers and workplaces that were not included in this study. Worker and workplace

circumstances vary and this sample likely did not capture all of that variation in terms of types and sizes of enterprises, and in terms of the quality of communications and labour relations. It was not possible to know the degree to which language barriers and cultural divides existed between other workers and employers that did not participate in this study. However, the basic terms and conditions of employment under the federally mandated SAWP and AS programs apply to all migrant farmworkers in Saskatchewan regardless of whether or not they participated in the present study. It is likely therefore, that there will be at least some if not many similarities between the experiences of the migrant workers and employers interviewed as part of this study and the experiences of other migrant workers and employers of migrant workers who were not part of this study either because they were not approached or because they declined to participate. Interested observers may also find that information and lessons gleaned from this study are helpful for understanding the experiences of migrant farmworkers and employers that live and work in other jurisdictions. While certain conditions of employment in both the SAWP and AS programs may vary in other provinces, at least some of the literature reviewed and the field data discussed may also be applicable to the development and implementation of better outreach and educational initiatives in other Canadian and even US regions. While pursuing a multi-pronged, multi-methods, interdisciplinary field inquiry in the understudied context of Saskatchewan agriculture, I also undertook a detailed review of relevant research literature pertaining to other Canadian locales where migrant labour is employed. I likewise reviewed theories and practices related to adult education for workers. In doing all this work, I was aiming to strike a balance between context-specificity and generalizability (see Sbicca, 2012).

This study examines the experiences of 39 Latino migrant farmworkers working in Saskatchewan in 2012. It also integrates the perspectives of four other sets of respondents drawn from other relevant groups: 11 farmer-employers, two former Canadian farmworkers, two civil servants with OHS responsibilities, and two volunteers from a migrant worker support group. In addition, three Latina (female) farmworkers who were not included or counted in the formal interviews provided informal conversations and comments about their work experiences in Saskatchewan. The perspectives of all these participants contributed to building a richer and more robust understanding of the experiences of farmworkers with OHS and OHS education and training. They also helped to reveal complexities in the global and more local social contexts underlying

and mediating such experiences. Collecting responses from a range of participants with different roles and perspectives contributes to the reliability of the study as it provides another opportunity for comparison and cross-checking. The findings concerning key themes did not emanate from a single or small group of participants but from various groups of people with different standpoints and agendas. This should increase our confidence that the key issues that emerged are real issues and that key findings concerning these issues reflect the complex experiences and understandings of real people who participate in contemporary migrant labour programs that have implications for the economic viability and broader sustainability of agriculture in Saskatchewan. Crucially, studies such as this one allow us to pay attention to both material conditions/realities and the ideas that people have about them. They also allow us to delve deeper into the cultural understandings and "folklores" that surround and mediate the experiences and perceptions of workers and employers, and thus to shed some light on reasoning and behaviours that otherwise would be difficult to fathom/interpret.

Since the time that they participated in this study, some of the practices and work circumstances of workers and employers who were interviewed may have changed. Such changes may come about due to individual reflection and initiative, organizational and public policy changes, or other factors. This is to be expected and reflects not only the passage of time but a welcome aspect of research modalities that involve more prolonged and intensive forms of interaction: participation may cause people to revisit, reconsider, and rethink certain beliefs and taken-for-granted understandings about what is normal, desirable, or possible.

Of course, quantitative research is also important and can provide useful data as long as it is done with care and data are collected from (or about) a sample of participants or stakeholders that is reliably representative of the population under study. However, if samples are not representative, if response rates are low or skewed in favour of certain subpopulations, if survey questions are ambiguous, confusing, or difficult to answer, or if the issues under study are sensitive and very complex, quantitative data may provide little usable insight even when large probability samples are surveyed. Qualitative interviews provide opportunities to build rapport with participants, whereas more quantitative approaches generally do not offer such prospects—at least not to any significant degree. Given that this study is in some senses a pioneering project in the Province of Saskatchewan, it provides a foundation and starting point for future research. Especially when a

research topic has not previously been much explored, there are arguments for doing qualitative research such as the present study before attempting any larger-sample survey research. Interviews, observation, and more casual interactions allowed me to develop some preliminary ideas and understandings about certain gendered dimensions of employee experiences, including those associated with safety and health. However, more time for interaction and field observations with both female and male migrant farmworkers would have been required to address such issues systematically. It would also have been important to build this intention into the sampling process. For various reasons, the majority of the women interviewed formally for this study were employed at one farm enterprise and I was able to make only one research visit to this workplace. A single visit was not sufficient to learn about the particularities of the experiences of these women. Moreover, while I was able to speak with or formally interview a few other women who worked at other agricultural enterprises, I cannot claim to have captured anywhere near the full range of experiences, concerns, and priorities with respect to migration and work, nor a full understanding of the interactions of gender, class, and ethnicity. As explained in Chapter 4, I was unable to fully execute a classic version of (critical) ethnography due mainly to circumstances beyond my control that limited my ability to interact more at length with both farmworkers and employers. As an expedient and reasonable alternative, I followed the principles of focused (critical) ethnography, as described in section 3.1.1. One advantage of this approach was to increase the breadth of the study by adding more enterprises, and informants representing various kinds of connection to the concerns under investigation as well as more diverse perspectives and experiences.

6.4. Contributions

This study makes contributions to the fields of agricultural occupational health and safety, intercultural communications, adult education for migrant labourers, and migrant labour studies. It provides important insights into the intersections of seasonal/temporary migrant labour programs, agricultural work, language and intercultural communications issues, worker culture, enterprise/employer culture, and adult education and training. The proposed adult education frameworks contribute to enriching or complementing existing health and safety education approaches that are frequently focused too exclusively on technical concerns and fixes. It is

important that this work contributes to a recognition that we are dealing with human beings with personal and group histories, with conflicting interests (with conflicts that are sometimes internal and sometimes between and among social actors), and with feelings and emotions that can affect judgement and choices.

Because they sensitize us to a broader array of factors and considerations, attention to adult education principles and to social dimensions of sustainability in agriculture can help us to understand the design requirements for holistic and progressive agricultural OHS education and training. This implies going beyond more traditional and reductionist approaches that tend to focus more narrowly on key medical concerns (e.g., disease and injury) and/or engineering/technical approaches (e.g., workplace risk assessment and hazard recognition). It is important to emphasize, however, that the more expansive and integrative adult education frameworks proposed do not represent a rejection of the knowledge and techniques of these more conventional OHS approaches. Rather they look to add in more of the human (or social) dimensions of workplace relations with attention to the special challenges of intercultural interactions. Part of the enhanced richness and power of proposed adult education frameworks for OHS derives from the integration of other worldviews and paradigms. Several different frameworks were integrated in order to adequately address the key research questions and in order to frame a more adequate adult education approach and curriculum: the social dimensions of agricultural sustainability, empowering approaches to worker agricultural OHS education and training, critical ethnography, and a socioecological model of health.

Employing a sustainability lens that pays special attention to human or social dimensions of agricultural sustainability allows this study to ask questions about some relatively neglected aspects of agricultural development and agricultural sustainability. Along with the health and wellbeing of agricultural workers and employers, fair and equitable conditions of employment are key and fundamental facets of the social sustainability of agriculture. In this regard, critical ethnography helps us to reveal and analyze some of the equity challenges that relate to power differentials between workers and employers. Critical ethnography, in combination with (a more critical, multifactorial version) of intercultural communications theory, helps us to understand

and to more effectively address the challenges of communication and interaction in the workplace.

This study can contribute to the scrutiny, analysis, and possible modification of labour market agreements and arrangements involving the governments of Canada, Mexico, and Nicaragua. In combination with other initiatives, the performance and wellbeing of workers who undertake international migration can be improved by providing more preparation to them and their prospective employers. This includes at a minimum, language training and study opportunities for migrants and their employers, enhanced and broadened OHS education and training for all involved, and education regarding worker rights and workplace relations for all who are party to such arrangements. Combined with other relevant research, this study can also serve as a starting point for the design of educational outreach initiatives that incorporate an awareness of the identities, cultures, and concerns of the various participants. Additionally, it provides insights into ways of strengthening both local and international labour relations by honouring the contributions of all participants by recognizing and taking steps to augment their capacities and capabilities as intelligent and creative human beings (see Timmermann & Félix, 2015).

Such initiatives are important for co-constructing a more fully and indisputably sustainable agricultural sector in Saskatchewan. Building on this study, governments, researchers, and other interested parties have opportunities to further investigate how various aspects of temporary foreign worker programs impact migrant farmworkers and their employers, and how OHS and OHS training can be reconceptualized to address broadly conceived sustainability issues more holistically. This study may also contribute to raising awareness among the general public in the Prairie region about the challenges faced by migrant farmworkers and their employers. If implemented, the recommendations presented here can also benefit the families of migrant farmworkers. Concerns about workplace health and safety, communications, and general employment conditions are a potential source of stress for family members left behind. Moreover, workers who come home injured, exhausted, or psychologically marked by their experiences in Canada cannot fully fulfill their roles as partners, parents and breadwinners. A much more positive scenario for sending communities—and a worthy contribution to the sustainable development of these areas/countries—would be for migrant workers to return home in good

health, with enhanced skills and capabilities, and with new ideas about how to work collaboratively and safely.

6.5. Personal Reflections on the Study

Before moving to Canada from Mexico, I was aware that, every year, Mexican workers and other Latinos travelled to Canada to work in agriculture. Upon moving to Canada, I became curious to learn more about the experiences of Latinos, their challenges, successes, and contributions in temporary foreign worker programs. In 2007, I happened to meet two Saskatchewan employers of Mexican migrant farmworkers. Although we talked only briefly, I became more curious about the experiences of both employers and workers with temporary foreign worker programs in agriculture. The first comment shared by one of these employers was that the only thing Mexican workers wanted was to obtain as many hours of work as they could and that they competed with each other to do so. The other employer shared that he hoped to display bilingual workplace safety posters at his farm but that he did not know how to translate these materials into Spanish so his employees would understand.

On the various trips that I made back to Mexico each December, I saw many Mexican and Latino farmworkers on my flights. When we landed at the Mexico City airport, I saw many Mexicans at the baggage carousel picking up heavy suitcases, large TVs, and bikes. I approached one or two of them and tried to strike up a brief conversation because I was intrigued about how they communicate with local staff/personnel and supervisors at their Canadian workplaces. One person I approached said that he communicated by making hand signals and by following examples.

Although this Mexican worker was hesitant about casually talking with me, he added that he believed he was too old to learn English, and that, as he ages, it is less likely that he will be able to do well in English language classes. He soon stopped talking to me because he was collecting his luggage, which was obviously more important than talking to a stranger. It was Christmas, and the workers looked happy to be back home and anxious to be delivering their presents to their loved ones. Many of these workers still had to travel several hours by bus to get to their

final destinations. I was left with many questions and became more interested in learning about the work lives of these migrant farmworkers.

My first thoughts were that they were lucky to be getting those jobs because they are paid in dollars. They were lucky also because it is difficult to survive and succeed economically in rural Mexico, and because there are hundreds of Mexicans "lined up" waiting for an opportunity like this. However, I also thought that they were unlucky because they have to struggle with other challenges such as cold weather, language barriers, culture shock and loneliness, along with related impacts of family separation.

In 2008, when I was attempting to define a research topic for my Masters in Educational Communications and Technology at the University of Saskatchewan, I thought about designing a basic English as a Second Language program for Mexican farmworkers working in Canada. I hoped to share my idea with an employer and his/her workers, but when I contacted an employer I knew, I did not hear anything back. I ended up working on a different though somewhat connected project related to adult education and communications. Once I had completed this MEd, I entered a doctoral program in the School of Environment and Sustainability at the University of Saskatchewan. Because I share nationality, language, and culture with the Mexican migrant farmworkers, I found it personally meaningful to research the experiences of these workers. My BSc in Agronomy (Universidad Veracruzana or the University of Veracruz), my work experience in agricultural extension in Mexico, and my training in adult education theory and practice all contributed to equipping me with skills I needed to undertake research on temporary foreign worker programs in Canadian agriculture. The MSc in Tropical Agroecosystems (Colegio de Postgraduados Campus Veracruz) that I completed in Mexico also provided me with some experience conducting participatory research/rural appraisals with farmers and labourers in rural Mexico. In sum, I thought I was a suitable candidate to study temporary foreign worker programs in the agricultural sector in Canada.

When I started the fieldwork for this dissertation, I learned that there were not only Mexicans working on Saskatchewan farms. There were other Latinos, including Nicaraguans, as well as farmworkers from Eastern Europe and the Philippines. Some farms employed both Mexicans and

Nicaraguans, and my study came to reflect this reality. Although including both groups in my study made it more complicated, it also made it richer and more representative of the true complexity of Saskatchewan workplaces and labour hiring practices.

Identifying and making initial contact with farmer-employers turned out to be a difficult and time-consuming task. Thanks to help from some University of Saskatchewan contacts and from other local community contacts, I was eventually able to contact and interview a sufficient sample of employers and Latino migrant farmworkers. The participating employers notified the workers that I was going to invite them to participate in an interview. Although I speak the same language, I was still a stranger to the workers and had to earn their trust. Perhaps the fact of being a stranger limited the participation rate in some workplaces where some of the Latino workers opted not to participate. Of course this social distance potentially cuts both ways, my stranger status may also have been helpful in allowing some of the interviewees to open up without fearing that their statements would somehow get back to people they knew or with whom they were in contact.

In some instances, I noticed a degree of subordination of some workers to their employers when the employer invited them to participate in the interviews. I made it clear that the invitation was not meant to push workers into participating. Because most of the employers introduced me to their workers and talked about my study, perhaps some workers automatically perceived me as an authority figure, or maybe as a friendly visitor. Unfortunately, it was not possible to accurately gauge how these workers perceived me. I assured the workers that their participation was absolutely voluntary, and some workers declined to participate in my interviews. However, most of the workers were co-operative and seemed enthusiastic about participating and sharing stories about their experiences in Saskatchewan.

Sharing the same language and essentially the same culture as the Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers was not necessarily helpful in all the interviews. There were some Mexican workers who were very skeptical (and cautious) about my presence. Perhaps they thought I was a government inspector or something like that. Those employers who declined my invitations to participate in my study might also have perceived me with similar suspicion.

It seems to me that, at least for some of the Latino migrant farmworkers, the interviews were productive and memorable. Although my interactions with the workers were relatively brief, I was able to build a certain level of trust with many of them. And although relatively short, these encounters were full of strong impressions. I vividly remember these workers and their employers—their voices, facial expressions, and stories. What I remember most, however, is their frustration at not having good job opportunities in their home countries. They reaffirmed this sentiment after seeing how their Canadian counterparts have access to a variety of employment opportunities and to better wages. Despite their frustrations, they were proud that they had come to Canada to work. They perceived themselves as achievers. Ultimately for these workers, success means to move forward within their home communities. Of course, they miss family members, relatives, friends, familiar foods and cooking, (good) weather, and many other aspects of their own cultural milieus. Typically, they also have business and other projects in mind or already underway. These workers have deep roots in their home countries and they evinced no interest in migrating to Canada permanently.

I believe I built good relations with most of the employers. A couple of them mentioned that my study was important for them and for the Province. Similarly, at least a couple Latino farmworkers commented that they were enthusiastic about being interviewed. After finishing a group interview, one male Latino farmworker from Mexico asked me: "*Okay, I really liked the interview, but, what do YOU* [emphasis original] *think about our responses?*" I said that their responses and participation in my study were important to influence policy makers in their country and in Canada to improve the program in which they participate in. In another group interview, another Mexican worker commented that they appreciated the interview. He added that if there are positive changes to the program in the future, it will be good for existing and future workers. He made it clear that even if he did not continue coming to Canada to work, he would be content because other workers would be able to benefit from some potential changes. Hoping for positive change, his words were: "*Si no los vemos nosotros, que los vean los que vengan*", or "If we don't see them [the changes], other [new workers] get to see them."

I told the workers that one of my missions as a graduate student is to present my findings publicly in seminars, congresses, and symposia (I explained to the workers what these kinds of meetings

are for) to raise awareness about the positive and less positive aspects of participation in such temporary foreign worker programs. The aforementioned Mexican male worker replied: "*Pues ojalá que sí compartas tu estudio en esas reuniones que dices*", or "Hopefully you share your study in some of those reunions you're talking about." The words of this worker became a charge to me, something that will haunt me if I do not follow through on the undertaking.

To date, I have presented preliminary findings in two departmental seminars at the University of Saskatchewan, in one invited lecture/talk for a Saskatchewan-based NGO, and in two invited class lectures at the University of Saskatchewan (one at the undergraduate level and the other at the graduate level). Additionally, with my dissertation supervisor I co-authored a peer-reviewed article that was published in 2015 under the title "Latino Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Language Barriers and Health and Safety.[29] I also presented preliminary findings at six conferences or workshops in Canada (Fredericton, NB, Vancouver, BC, Lévis, QC, Prince George, BC, Saint Catharines, ON, and Saskatoon, SK). My participation in these professional gatherings was funded by the Public Health and the Agricultural Rural Ecosystem (PHARE) graduate training program. In Ottawa, I also attended a presentation on the work experiences of Latino migrant farmworkers given by a Canadian university researcher/professor. At this presentation, there were Canadian and Mexican civil servants with different responsibilities or roles in relation to agricultural temporary foreign worker program operation. During the questions and answers period of the meeting, I was able to talk about some of the needs of Latino migrant farmworkers in Saskatchewan.

In addition, I have contributed as a co-author to a briefing note on exposures experienced by seasonal and migrant workers in agriculture (Viveros-Guzmán & Bartlett, 2016) that was submitted for publication and discussion at the *2016 National Summit on the Control of Agricultural Injury and Death in Canada: Transforming Today's Science into Tomorrow's Prevention* in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The goal of this summit is to work with stakeholders such as policy makers, industry representatives, knowledge transfer experts, and researchers from across Saskatchewan and Canada to identify key research areas in agricultural health and safety

[29] Full citation in the literature cited section.

and to propose solutions to challenges that affect the health and safety of producers and their families, agricultural workers, and rural people in general.

With respect to another social or human side of this study, I believe that the social dimensions of sustainable development in agriculture should include an aspect that is currently being overlooked. It is not just the governments of the labour-sending countries or private recruiters that are the sources of this international migrant labour force. In one sense, labour-sending countries are indeed the senders or suppliers of labour because of the power of the state to authorize such arrangements, and to recruit and select workers. In other words, labour-receiving and labour-sending governments are the administrators of various aspects of these migrant labour programs. However, I believe that the real source of this labour are the mothers—many of them single mothers—of the migrant farmworkers.

It is, in fact, mothers who are the real suppliers of workers that are sent to labour-receiving countries or to other locales within their own countries. For these Latina mothers, raising children implies tremendous amounts of work, long-term sacrifice, and economic struggle. Perhaps these mothers may be aware that, at some point, a son or a daughter will be at risk of being commoditized as a farm labourer either in their own country or abroad (or both). In one way or another, the role of these mothers may be invisible to policy makers and other (national and international) stakeholders, and perhaps disregarded by academia and researchers. I recommend researching the lives and experiences of these mothers to better understand their (mostly uncompensated) roles and contributions. Of course, the partners (wives) of male migrant workers are also important and unacknowledged contributors. They play significant roles in supporting and underwriting this migration with their own additional domestic labour. While their husbands are in Canada, the wives become *de facto* single parents with responsibilities for caring for and supporting their children and, in some cases, the children's grandparents.

During the fieldwork, I mostly traveled alone. I remember driving the gravel roads of rural Saskatchewan. Whenever a vehicle passed me, I could see nothing due to the dust. I also remember driving in the dark, as most of the interviews were conducted at night. I could barely find my way back to the main roads. To me, the gravel roads all looked the same—and endless.

There were other challenges, too, like arriving at farms where three or four dogs would make it difficult to get out of my vehicle. One night, I saw a fox running along the shoulder of the road. I slowed down so it could keep pace with my vehicle and we advanced together. I wanted to think of this animal as company and as a sign that I was on the right road—and everything went well. This too was a memorable moment.

Overall, it was a privilege to interview the Mexican and Nicaraguan farmworkers, their employers, supporters, and other informed stakeholders. Of course, I am thankful to all of them and to the many other people who helped me to complete this dissertation. I feel grateful for having the opportunity to meet and learn from all these people. I also feel honored to have had so many people share their perceptions and perspectives with me. Finally, I feel personally satisfied because this research experience and the lessons learned are now mine and among my most valuable possessions. I am left with hope and optimism that the circumstances of Latino and other migrant farmworkers will improve. I have learned a great deal about the complex conditions faced by migrant workers and I trust that my observations and recommendations can be of some use to government agencies, non-governmental support and advocacy organizations, OHS and other researchers, trainers and educators, healthcare providers, farmworkers, and the farmers with whom they are employed. I end this dissertation with gratitude, admiration, and pride.

LITERATURE CITED

Alli, B. O. (2008). *Fundamental principles of occupational health and safety*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office-International Labour Organization.

Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2013). Occupational health and safety and sustainable development in Ghana. *International Journal of Business Administration, 4*(2), 74-78.

Anderson, E., & Lundqvist, P. (2014). Gendered agricultural space and safety: Towards embodied, situated knowledge. *Journal of Agromedicine, 19*(3), 303-315.

Arcury, T. A., & Quandt, S. A. (1998). Occupational and environmental health risks in farm labor. *Human Organization, 57*(3), 331-334.

Arcury, T. A., & Quandt, S. A. (2003). An exploratory analysis of occupational skin disease among Latino migrant and seasonal farmworkers in North Carolina. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health, 9*(3), 221-232.

Arcury, T. A., & Quandt, S. A. (2009). Pesticide exposure among farmworkers and their families in the Eastern United States: Matters of social and environmental justice. In T. A. Arcury, & S. A. Quandt (Eds.), *Latino farmworkers in the Eastern United States: Health, safety and justice* (pp. 103-129). New York, NY: Springer.

Arcury, T. A., Estrada, J. M., & Quandt, S. A. (2010). Overcoming language and literacy barriers in safety and health training of agricultural workers. *Journal of Agromedicine, 15*(3), 236-248.

Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: An analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 1*(3), 385-405.

Audet, P., Walshe-Roussel, B., Cal, V., Caal, F., Otarola R. M., Sánchez, V. P., Poveda, L., Pesek, T., & Arnason, J. T. (2013). Indigenous ex situ conservation of Q'eqchi' Maya medicinal plant resources at the Itzamma garden Indian Creek, Belize, Central America. *Human Ecology, 41*(2), 313-324.

Avila, M., Deve, F., & Mundy, P. (2005). Participatory policy development for sustainable agriculture and rural development: Guidelines from the sustainable agriculture and rural development farming systems evolution project. Book 28. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations-Rural Development Division. Retrieved from http://www.mamud.com/Docs/particpatory_policy_development.pdf

Baiju, P. V. (2007). Social development: Environmental sustainability and social wellbeing. *Rajagiri Journal of Social Development, 3*(2), 175-198.

Baker, R., & Stock, L. (2006). Labor unions: Their role in occupational and environmental health. In B. S. Levy, D. H. Wegman, S. L. Baron, & R. K. Sokas (Eds.), *Occupational*

and environmental health: Recognizing and preventing disease and injury (pp. 697-709). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Bakic-Miric, N. (2012). *An integrated approach to intercultural communication*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology, 41*(1), 63-105.

Barkin, D. (2000). Overcoming the neoliberal paradigm: Sustainable popular development. *Journal of Developing Societies, 16*(1), 163-180.

Barnetson, B. (2010). *The political economy of workplace injury in Canada*. Edmonton, Canada: Athabasca University Press.

Barnetson, R. (2012). No right to be safe: justifying the exclusion of Alberta farm workers from health and safety legislations. *Socialist Studies, 8*(2), 134-162.

Baron, S. L., Beard, S., Davis, L. K., Delp, L., Forst, L., Kidd-Taylor, A., Liebman, A. K., Linnan, L., Punnett, L., & Welch, L. S. (2013). Promoting integrated approaches to reducing health inequities among low-income workers: Applying a social ecological framework. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 57*(5), 539-556.

Basok, T. (2000). Migration of Mexican seasonal farm workers to Canada and development: Obstacles to productive investment. *The International Migration Review, 34*(1), 79-97.

Basok, T. (2002). *Tortillas and tomatoes: Transmigrant Mexican harvesters in Canada*. Quebec City: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Basok, T., Bélanger, D., & Rivas, E. (2014). Reproducing deportability: Migrant agricultural workers in South-western Ontario. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(9), 1394-1413.

Basok, T., & Carasco, E. (2010). Advancing the rights of non-citizens in Canada: A human rights approach to migrant rights. *Human Rights Quarterly, 32*(2), 342-366.

Benach, J., Muntaner, C., Benavides, F. G., Amable, M., & Jodar, P. (2002). A new occupational health agenda for a new work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 28*(3), 191-196.

Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Binford, L. (2003). Migrant remittances and (under) development in Mexico. *Critique of Anthropology, 23*(3), 305-336.

Binford, L. (2006, August). The seasonal agricultural workers program and Mexican development. *FOCAL Policy paper*. Ottawa, ON: The Canadian Foundation for the Americas. Retrieved from http://www.focal.ca/pdf/migration_Binford_seasonal%20agricultural%20workers%20program%20Mexican%20development_August%202006_FPP-06-07.pdf

Binford, L. (2013). *Tomorrow we're all going to the harvest: Temporary Foreign Worker Programs and neoliberal political economy*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bitsch, V. (2010). Labor aspects of sustainability. *20th Annual World Forum and Symposium of the International Food and Agribusiness Management Association*. Boston: Michigan State University. Retrieved from http://www.ifama.org/files/conf/2010/76_paper.pdf

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Bhola, H. S. (2006). Adult and lifelong education for poverty reduction: A critical analysis of contexts and conditions. *Review of Education*, *52*(3/4), 231-246.

Bolaria, B. S. (1988). The health effects of powerlessness: The case of immigrant farm labour. In G. S. Basran and D. A. Hay (Eds.), *The political economy of agriculture in Western Canada* (pp. 109-124). Saskatoon, SK: Garamond Press.

Bolaria, B. S., & Von Elling-Bolaria, R. (1997). Capital, Labour, Migrations. In B.S. Bolaria and R. Von Elling-Bolaria (Eds.), *International Labour Migrations* (pp. 1-17). New Delhi, India. Oxford University Press.

Bopp, M., & Bopp, J. (2001). *Recreating the world: A practical guide to building sustainable communities*. Calgary, Canada: Four Worlds Press.

Bratton, J., Mills, J. H., Pyrch, T., & Sawchuk, P. (2004). *Workplace learning: A critical introduction*. Aurora, Canada: Garamond Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology volume 2 research designs* (pp. 57-71). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Brem, M. (2006). *Migrant workers in Canada: A review of the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program*. Policy Brief. Ottawa, ON: The North-South Institute. Retrieved from http://www.nsi-ins.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2006-Migrant-Workers-in-Canada-A-review-of-the-Canadian-Seasonal-Agricultural-Workers-Program.pdf

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, *32*(7), 513-531.

Brown, G. D. (2002). The global threats to workers' health and safety on the job. *Social Justice, 29*(3/89), 12-25.

Burawoy, M. (2003). Revisits: an outline of a theory of reflexive ethnography. *American Sociological Review*, *68*(5), 645-679.

Bryman, A., & Teevan, J. J. (2005). *Social research methods*. Don Mills, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Carson, W. G., & Henenberg, C. (1989). Social justice at the workplace: The political economy of occupational health and safety laws. *Social Justice, 16*(3), 124-139.

Castles, S., & Delgado, W. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Migration and development: Perspectives from the South*. Geneva: International Migration Institute –Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas-International Organization for Migration. Retrieved from http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migracion/rimd/coleccion_america_latina/migration_and_development/MDPerspectives_South.pdf

Charon, J. M. (2002). *The meaning of sociology*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis. *The Psychologist, 26*(2), 120-123.

Colby, C. (1997). *From Oaxaca to Ontario: Mexican contract labor in Canada and the impact at home*. Davis, CA: The University of California-The California Institute for Rural Studies.

Cole, H. P. (2002). Cognitive-behavioral approaches to farm community safety education: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health, 8*(2), 145-159.

Colligan, M. J., & Cohen, A. (2004). The role of training in promoting workplace safety and health. In J. Barling and M. R. Frone (Eds.), *The psychology of workplace safety* (pp. 223-248). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Courville, M. D., Wadsworth, G., & Schenker, M. (2016, March). "We just have to continue working": Farmworker self-care and heat-related illness. *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*. Advance online publication http://dx.doi.org/10.5304/jafscd.2016.062.014, pp. 143–164. Retrieved from http://www.agdevjournal.com/volume-6-issue-2/628-farmer-self-care.html

Cox, S.J., & Cheyne, A. J. T. (2000). Assessing safety culture in offshore environments. *Safety Science, 34*(1-3), 111-129.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Cruz, E. V., & Higginbottom, G. (2013). The use of focused ethnography in nursing research. *Nurse Researcher, 20*(4), 36-43.

de Luna Villalón. M. E. (2011). Mexican temporary agricultural workers in Canada: A language and migration approach. [dissertation]. [London (ON)]: The University of Western Ontario. Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/257/

Dima, N. (1990). *Cross cultural communication*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Dixon, M., Jonas, S., & McCaughan, E. (1982). Reindustrialization and the transnational labor force in the United States today. In M. Dixon and S. Jonas (Eds.), *The new nomads: Immigration and changes in the international division of labour*. *Contemporary Marxism No. 5* (pp. 101-115). San Francisco, CA: Synthex Press.

Dosman, J., Hagel, L., King, N., Koehncke, N., Kirychuk, S., Trask, C., Neudorf, J., Day, L., Voaklander, D., & Pickett W. (2015). The hierarchy of control in the epidemic of farm injury. *Journal of Agromedicine, 20*(3), 360-369.

Dos Santos, W. L. P. (2008). Scientific literacy: A Freirean perspective as a radical view of humanistic science education. *Science Education, 93*(2), 361-382.

Daffron, S. R. & North, M. W. (2011). *Successful transfer of learning*. Malabar, FL, USA: Krieger Pub. Co.

Dresner, S. (2009). *The principles of sustainability* (2nd Ed.). London, England: Earthscan.

Eakin, J. M., & MacEachen, E. (1998). Health and the social relations of work: A study of then health-related experiences of employees in small workplaces. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 20*(6), 896-914.

Elkind, P. D. (2007). Perceptions of risk, stressors, and locus of control influence intentions to practice safety behaviors in agriculture. *Journal of Agromedicine, 12*(4), 7-25.

Elling, R. H. (1989). The political economy of workers' health and safety. *Social Science & Medicine, 28*(11), 1171-1182.

Encalada, G. E. (2006, July/August). Justice for migrant workers: Reflections on the importance of community organizing. *Migration*, 23-25. Retrieved from http://www.socialistproject.ca/relay/r12_grez.pdf

Ervin, A. M. (2005). *Applied anthropology: Tools and perspectives for contemporary practice*. Boston , MA: Pearson.

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2013a). Hiring agricultural workers. ESDC's website. Date modified: 2013-12-13. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/agriculture/index.shtml

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada, (2013b). Labour market opinions, annual statistics. Top countries of citizenship according to the number of temporary foreign

worker positions on positive Labour Market Opinions, by province/territory. Date modified: 2013-10-28. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/lmo_statistics/annual-top-country.shtml

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2014). Number of temporary foreign workers positions on positive labour market opinions under the agricultural occupations, by location of employment. Labour Market Opinions-Annual Statistics. Government of Canada. Date modified 2014-01-28. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/lmo_statistics/annual-agriculture.shtml

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2015a). Hiring seasonal agricultural workers. ESDC's website. Date modified: 2015-01-20. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/agriculture/seasonal/index.shtml

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2015b). Agricultural stream. ESDC's website. Date modified: 2015-01-20. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/eng/jobs/foreign_workers/agriculture/general/index.shtml

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2016a). Hire a temporary worker through the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program – Program requirements. Date modified: 2016-04-05. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/foreign_workers/hire/seasonal_agricultural/requirements.page

ESDC Employment and Social Development Canada (2016b). Hire a temporary foreign worker through the Agricultural Stream - Program requirements. Date modified: 2016-04-05. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/foreign_workers/hire/agricultural/requirements.page

ESDC, Employment and Social Development Canada (2016c). Annual Labour Market Impact Assessment statistics 2007-2014. Date modified: 2016-03-11. Retrieved from http://www.esdc.gc.ca/en/reports/foreign_workers/2014/lmia_annual_statistics/agricultural.page#sk

Fairey, D., Hanson, C., MacInnes, G., McLaren, A. T., Otero, G., Preibisch, K., & Thompson, M. (2008). Cultivating farmworker rights: Ending the exploitation of immigrant and migrant farm workers in BC. Project Report. *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives – BC*. Retrieved from http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/BC_Office_Pubs/bc_2008/bc_farmworkers_full.pdf

FAO (2005). *Participatory policy development for sustainable agriculture and rural development: Guidelines from the sustainable agriculture and rural development farming systems evolution project*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations-Rural Development Division. Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/sard/common/ecg/2697/en/PariticpatoryPolicyDevelopment.pdf

Faraday, F. (2012). Made in Canada: How the law constructs migrant workers' insecurity. Toronto, ON: George Cedric Metcalf Charitable Foundation. Retrieved from http://metcalffoundation.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Made-in-Canada-Full-Report.pdf

Feenstra, G. (2002). Creating space for sustainable food systems. Lessons from the field. *Agriculture and Human Values, 19*(2), 99-106.

Fetterman, D. (2004). Ethnography concepts. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of social science research methods* (pp. 328-332). Vol. 1. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Field, W. E., & Tormoehlen, R. L. (2006). Education and training as intervention strategies. In J.E. Lessenger & F. Facoem (Eds.), *Agricultural medicine: A practical guide* (pp. 42-52). New York, NY: Springer.

Flocks, J., Mac, V. V. T., Runkle, J., Tovar-Aguilar, J. A., Economos, J., & McCauley, L. A. (2013). Female farmworkers' perceptions of heat-related illness and pregnancy health. *Journal of Agromedicine, 18*(4), 350-358.

Foladori, G. (2006). The social unsustainability of sustainable development. *Portularia Revista de Trabajo Social, 6*(2), 4-16.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2008). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 115-159). London, GB: SAGE Publications.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing.

Friedland, W. H. (2004). Agrifood, globalization and commodity systems. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food, 12*(1), 5-16.

Friedland, W. H., Barton, A. E., & Thomas, R. J. (1981). *Manufacturing green gold: Capital, labor, and technology in the lettuce industry*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Fudge, J., & MacPhail, F. (2009). The temporary foreign worker program in Canada: Low-skilled workers as an extreme form of flexible labor. *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 31*(5), 5-45.

Geiser, K., & Rosenberg, B. J. (2006). The social context of occupational and environmental health. In B.S. Levy, D.H. Wegman, S.L. Baron, & R. K. Sokas (Eds.), *Occupational and environmental health: Recognizing and preventing disease and injury* (pp. 21-38). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Gertler, M. (2006). Synergy and strategic advantage: co-operatives and sustainable development. Saskatoon: Centre for the Study of Co-operatives.

Gibb, H. (2006). Farmworkers from afar: Results from an international study of seasonal farmworkers from Mexico and the Caribbean working on Ontario farms. *The North South Institute.* Ontario: The Ontario Trillium Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.nsi-ins.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2006-Farmworkers-from-Afar.pdf

Giralt, A. (2012). A decade after Guatemala's agreement on identity and rights of Indigenous Peoples: Mayan-Tz'utujil Women's view on health healing, and disease. *Health Care for Women International, 33*(5), 440-456.

Government of Saskatchewan (2015, July). Farm safety's website and guide. Government's website. December 22, 2014 Retrieved from https://www.saskatchewan.ca/business/safety-in-the-workplace/hazards-and-prevention/safety-in-professions-and-industry/farm-safety

Government of Saskatchewan Ministry of Economy (2015). Saskatchewan Health Services Card and Health Coverage. Retrieved from http://www.economy.gov.sk.ca/immigration/health-card Accessed April 21, 2016.

Grossman, R., & Salas, E. (2011). The transfer or training: What really matters. *International Journal of Training and Development, 15*(2), 103-120.

Grote, G., & Künzler, C. (2000). Diagnosis of safety culture in safety management audits. *Safety Science, 34*(1), 131-150.

Guttenstein, E., Scialabba, N. E., Loh, J., & Courville, S. (2010, August). A conceptual framework for progressing towards sustainability in the agriculture and food sector. *FAO-International Social and Environmental Accreditation and Labelling (ISEAL) Alliance.* Retrieved from http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/al322e/al322e00.pdf

Hagel, L., Pahwa, P., Dosman, J. A., & Pickett, W. (2013). Economic worry and the presence of safety hazards on farms. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 53*(1), 156-160.

Harding, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis from start to finish*. London, UK: SAGE.

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Hennebry, J. L. (2009, Winter). Mobile vulnerabilities transnational risks: Temporary agricultural migrants in Ontario. INSCAN *International Settlement in Canada, 22*(3), 10-15. Retrieved from http://www.carleton.ca/cimss/inscan-e/v22_3e.pdf

Hennebry, J. L. (2012). Permanently temporary? Agricultural migrant workers and their integration in Canada. IRPP Study no. 26, February. Montreal, QC: IRPP. Retrieved from

http://irpp.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/research/diversity-immigration-and-integration/permanently-temporary/IRPP-Study-no26.pdf

Hennebry, J. L., & McLaughlin, J. (2012). The exception that proves the rule: Structural vulnerability, health risks, and consequences for temporary migrant farm workers in Canada. In P.T. Lenard & C. Straehle (Eds.), *Legislated inequality: Temporary labour migration in Canada* (pp. 117-138). Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2011). *The practice of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Hilgert, J. (2009). A new frontier for industrial relations: Workplace health and safety as a human right. In J. A. Gross & L. Compa (Eds.), *Human rights in labor and employment relations: International and domestic perspectives* (pp. 43-71). Champaign, IL: Labor and Employment Relations Association.

Hopkins, A. (2006). Studying organisational cultures and their effects on safety. *Safety Science, 44*(10), 875-889.

Horgan, M., & Liinamaa, S. (2012). Double precarity: Experiences of former seasonal agricultural workers who settle in rural Nova Scotia. Acadia University and Atlantic Metropolis Centre's working Paper no. 46-2012 Series. Halifax, NS. Retrieved from http://community.smu.ca/atlantic/documents/WP46HorganLiinamaa_004.pdf

Howse, D., Jeebhay, M. F., & Neis, B. (2012). The changing political economy of occupational health and safety in fisheries: Lessons from Eastern Canada and South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change, 12*(2), 344-363.

HRSDC Human Resources and Skills Development Canada and Statistics Canada (2011). National Occupational Classification 2011 (NOC 2011). December 22, 2014 Retrieved from http://www5.hrsdc.gc.ca/noc/english/noc/2011/pdf/PrintableVersionNOC2011.pdf

Hurst, P., Termine, P., & Karl, M. (2007). Agricultural workers and their contribution to sustainable agriculture and rural development. FAO Food and Agriculture Organization-ILO International Labour Organization-IUF International Union Food. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---actrav/documents/publication/wcms_113732.pdf

Hyslop-Margison, E.J., & Naseem, M.A. (2007). Career education as humanization: A Freirean approach to lifelong learning. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(4), 347-358.

IISD International Institute for Sustainable Development (2010). Sustainable development: From Brundtland to Rio 2012. High level panel on global sustainability, September 19, 2010. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/gsp/docs/GSP1-6_Background%20on%20Sustainable%20Devt.pdf

ILO International Labour Organization. (2003). *Decent work in agriculture: International workers' symposium on decent work in agriculture*. Geneva: International Labor Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---sector/documents/publication/wcms_161567.pdf

ILO International Labour Organization. (2004). Towards a fair deal for migrant workers in the global economy. Report VI. *International Labour Conference, 92nd Session*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/meetingdocument/kd00096.pdf

ILO International Labour Organization. (2006, June). *Facts on labour migration*. Geneva: International Labour Office. Geneva, Switzerland. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2006/106B09_492_engl.pdf

ILO International Labour Organization. (2010). *International labour migration: A rights-based approach*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/publication/wcms_208594.pdf

ILO International Labour Organization. (2011). *Safety and health in agriculture. ILO code of practice*. Geneva, Switzerland (Printed in France): International Labour Office.

Isaacs, L. K., & Bean, T. L. (1995). An overview of the Ohio migrant farmworker safety needs assessment. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health, 1*(4), 261-271.

Jackson, S. (2007). Freire re-viewed. *Educational Theory, 57*(2), 199-213.

Johnson, M. R. D. (2004). Cross-cultural communication in health. *Critical Cornerstone, 6*(1), 50-52.

Kallstrom, H. N., & Ljung, M. (2005). Social sustainability and collaborative learning. *Ambio, 34*(4/5), 376-382.

Kayes, A. B., & Yamazaki, Y. (2005). Transferring knowledge across-cultures: A learning competencies approach. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 18*(4), 87-100.

Kealey, D. J., Protheroe, D. R., MacDonald, D., & Vulpe, T. (2006). International projects: Some lessons on avoiding failure and maximizing success. *Performance Improvement, 45*(3), 38-46.

Knoblauch, H. (2005). Focused ethnography. *Forum Qualitative Social Research, 6*(3), 1-11.

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2011). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resources development*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Krieger, N. (2010). Workers are people too: Societal aspects of occupational health disparities—an ecosocial perspective. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 53*(2), 104-115.

Lapointe, L. (2010, April). Advancing the agriculture for development. FOCAL Point: Canada's spotlight on the Americas. *Canadian Foundation for the Americas, 9*(3), 10-11. Retrieved from http://www.focal.ca/pdf/focalpoint_april2010.pdf

Lenard, P. T., & Straehle, C. (2012). Introduction. In P. T. Lenard & C. Straehle (Eds.). *Legislated inequality: Temporary Labour Migration in Canada* (pp. 3-25). Quebec, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Leonard, J. (2011). Using Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory to understand community partnerships: A historical case study of one urban high school. *Urban Education, 46*(5), 987-1010.

Levenstein, C., & Wooding, J. (1997). *Work, health, and the environment: Old problems, new solutions*. New, York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Linnan, L. A., Sorensen, G., Colditz, G., Klar, N., & Emmons, K. M. (2001). Using theory to understand the multiple determinants of low participation in worksite health promotion programs. *Health Education & Behavior, 28*(5), 591-607.

Loomis, D., Schulman, M. D., Bailer, J., Stainback, K., Wheeler, M., Richardson, D. B., & Marshall, S. W. (2009). Political economy of US states and rates of fatal occupational injury. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(8), 1400-1408.

Loudoun, R., & Johnstone, R. (2009). Occupational health and safety in the modern world of work. In A. Wilkinson, N. Bacon, T. Redman & S. Snell (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of human resource management* (pp. 286-307). London, Great Britain: SAGE.

Lowe, S. J. (2007). Plus ça change? A comparative analysis of the seasonal agricultural workers program and the pilot foreign worker program for farm workers in Quebec. (M.A. Thesis in the Program of Immigration and Settlement Studies). Toronto, ON: Ryerson University.

Lundqvist, P., & Day, L. (2010). The 2008 Saskatoon declaration for the health, safety, and living conditions of migrant workers in agriculture. Proposed at the sixth international symposium: Public health and the agricultural-rural ecosystem, Saskatoon, Canada. October 22, 2008. *Journal of Agromedicine, 15*(1), 66-67.

Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide. North Carolina,: Family Health International-USAID 13-28. Retrieved from http://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Qualitative%20Research%20Methods%20-%20A%20Data%20Collector%27s%20Field%20Guide.pdf

Madison, S. (2012). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Magis, K., & Shinn, C. (2009). Emergent principles of social sustainability. In J. Dillar, V. Dujon, & M. C. King. (Eds.), *Understanding the social dimension of sustainability* (pp. 15-44). New York: Routledge-Taylor & Francis.

Marié, J. L. (2006). OSH and globalization, challenges for today. *Medicina del Lavoro, 97*(2), 125-131.

Marsick, V., & Volpe, M. (1999). *Informal learning on the job. Advances in developing human resources*. No. 3. San Francisco, CA: AHRD.

Martin, P., Abella, M., & Kuptsch, C. (2006). *Managing labor migration in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Yale University Press.

McCauley, L. A., Shapiro, S. E., Scherer, J. A., & Lasarev, M. R. (2004). Assessing pesticide safety among Hispanic migrant farmworkers in Oregon. *Journal of Agricultural Safety and Health, 10*(3), 177-186.

McLaughlin, J. (2007, October). Falling through the cracks: Seasonal foreign workers' health and compensation across borders. *The IAVGO reporting service, 21*(1), 1-18. Retrieved from http://www.injuredworkersonline.org/Documents/ONIWGconfMcLaughlin.pdf

McLaughlin, J. (2009). Trouble in our fields: Health and human rights among Mexican and Caribbean migrant farm workers in Canada. (Doctoral dissertation in Anthropology, University of Toronto). Toronto, ON. Retrieved from https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/24317/1/McLaughlin_Janet_E_200911_PhD_thesis.pdf

McLaughlin, J, Hennebry, J., & Haines, T. (2014). Paper versus practice: Health and safety protections and realities for temporary foreign agricultural workers in Ontario. *Perspectives Interdisciplinaires Sur le Travail et la Santé, 16*(2), 1-17.

Mysyk, A., England, M., & Avila, G. J. A. (2009). A case for certified interpreters for participants in the Canada/Mexico seasonal agricultural workers program. *Human Organization, 68*(3), 318-327.

Narushima, M., & Sanchez, A. L. (2014). Employers' paradoxical views about temporary foreign migrant workers' health: A qualitative study in rural farms in Southern Ontario. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 13*(65), 1-12.

NAS National Academy of Sciences (2010). *Toward sustainable agricultural systems in the 21st Century*. Committee on twenty-first Century systems agriculture. Washington, D.C: National Research Council of the National Academies-The National Academies Press. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=12832

Neuliep, J. W. (2006). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach*. Thousands Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Ni, X., & Branch, R. M. (2008, November-December). Augmenting the ADDIE paradigm for instructional design. *Educational Technology, 48*(6), 16-19.

O'Connor, T., Flynn, M., Weinstock, D., & Zanoni, J. (2014). Occupational safety and health education and training for underserved populations. *New Solutions, 24*(1), 83-106.

O'Leary, Z. (2010). *The essential guide to doing your research project*. Padstow, Cornwall, GB: SAGE.

Ollagnier, E. (2005). Training. In L. M. English (Ed.). *International encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 618-627). New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Otero, G., & Preibisch, K. L. (2010, August). Farmworker health and safety: Challenges for British Columbia: Challenges for British Columbia. A final research report. Simon Fraser University-University of Guelph. Retrieved from http://www.sfu.ca/~otero/docs/Otero-and-Preibisch-Final-Nov-2010.pdf

Otero, G., & Preibisch, K. L. (2015, November). Citizenship and precarious labour in Canadian agriculture. Vancouver, BC: CCPA Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives BC Office. Retrieved from http://www.cwp-csp.ca/resources/sites/default/files/resources/Citizenship%20and%20PRecarious%20Labour%20in%20Canada%20CCPA%202015.pdf

Ozdilek, Z., & Robeck, E. (2009). Operational priorities of instructional designers analyzed within the steps of the Addie instructional design model. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1*(1), 2046-2050.

Pang, M. (2013). Temporary foreign workers. Publication no. 2013-11-E February 7, 2013. Background Paper. Social Affairs Division and Parliamentary Information and Research Service. Ottawa, Canada: Library of Parliament. Retrieved from http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/2013-11-e.pdf

Perilla, J. L. (1998). Listening to migrant voices: Focus groups on health issues in South Georgia. *Journal of Community Health Nursing, 15*(4), 251-263.

Pfeffer, M. J. (1983). Social origins of three systems of farm production in the United States. *Rural Sociology, 48*(4), 540-562.

Pfortmueller, C. A., Kradolfer, D., Kunz, M., Lehmann, B., Lindner, G., & Exadaktylos, A. K. (2013). Injuries in agriculture: Injury severity and mortality. *Swiss Medical Weekly, 143*(13846), 1-8.

Pickett, W., Hartling, L., Brison, R. J., & Guernsey, J. R. (1999). Fatal work-related farm injuries in Canada, 1991-1995. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 160*(13), 1843-1848.

Pilgeram, R. (2011). "The only thing that isn't sustainable…Is the farmer": Social sustainability and the politics of class among Pacific Northwest farmers engaged in sustainable farming. *Rural Sociology, 76*(3), 375-393.

Pistrang, N., & Barker, C. (2012). Varieties of qualitative research: A pragmatic approach to selecting methods. In H Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology: Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological and biological* (pp. 5-18). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Plaza del Pino, F. J., Soriano, E., & Higginbottom, G. M. A. (2013). Sociocultural and linguistic boundaries influencing intercultural communication between nurses and Moroccan patients in southern Spain: A focused ethnography. *BMC Nursing, 12*(14), 1-8.

Poirier, A. A. (2010). *Producer agency in decisions to hire foreign labour in the Saskatchewan apiary sector*. (Thesis Master of Arts. Department of Geography and Planning). University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada.

Preibisch, K. L. (2004). Migrant agricultural workers and processes of social inclusion in rural Canada: Encuentros and desencuentros. *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 29*(57-58), 203-239.

Preibisch, K. L. (2007). Local produce, local labor: Labor mobility programs and global trade competitiveness in Canada. *Rural Sociology, 72*(3), 418-449.

Preibisch, K. L. (2010). Pick-your-own labor: Migrant workers and flexibility in Canadian agriculture. *International Migration Review, 44*(2), 404-441.

Preibisch, K. L. (2011). Migrant workers and changing work-place regimes in contemporary agricultural production in Canada. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture & Food, 19*(1), 62-82.

Preibisch, K. L. (2012). Development as remittances or development as freedom? Exploring Canada's temporary migration programs from a rights-based approach. In F. Faraday, J. Fudge, & E. Tucker (Eds.). *Constitutional labour rights in Canada: Farm workers and the Fraser case* (pp. 81-108). Toronto, ON: Irwin Law Inc.

Preibisch, K. L., & Binford, L. (2007). Interrogating racialized global labour supply: An exploration of the racial/national replacement of foreign agricultural workers in Canada. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 44*(1), 5-36.

Preibisch, K. L., & Encalada, G. E. (2010). The other side of el *Otro Lado*: Mexican migrant women and labour flexibility in Canadian agriculture. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 35*(2), 289-316.

Preibisch, K. L, & Hennebry, J. (2011). Temporary migration, chronic effects: The health of international migrant workers in Canada. *Canadian Medical Association CMAJ 14 183*(9), 1033-1038.

Preibisch, K. L., & Otero, G. (2014). Does citizenship status matter in Canadian agriculture? Workplace health and safety for migrant and immigrant labourers. *Rural Sociology, 79*(2), 174-199.

Prem, H. J. (1992). Spanish colonization and Indian poverty in central Mexico, 1521-1620. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 82*(3), 444-459.

Pysklywec, M., McLaughlin, J., Tew, M., & Haines, T. (2011). Doctors within borders: Meeting the health care needs of migrant farm workers in Canada. *CMAJ 14 Canadian Medical Association, 183*(9), 1039-1043.

Read, J., Zell, S., & Fernandez, L. (2013). Migrant voices: Stories of agricultural migrant workers in Manitoba. Errol Black Chair EBC in Labour Studies. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Manitoba Office. Retrieved from http://ccrweb.ca/files/migrant_voices_mb_report.pdf

Redclift, M., & Goodman, D. (1991). Introduction. In D. Goodman & M. Redclift (Eds.), *Environment and development in Latin America: The politics of sustainability* (pp. 1-23). New York, NY: Manchester University Press.

Riley, K., Delp, L., Cornelio, D., & Jacobs, S. (2012). From agricultural fields to urban asphalt: The role of worker education to promote California's heat illness prevention standard. *New Solutions, 22*(3), 297-323.

Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (2009). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Padstow, Cornwall, GB: SAGE.

Rogers, A. (1992). *Adults learning for development*. London, GB: Cassel.

Rogers, A., & Horrocks, N. (2010). *Teaching adults*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Ross, L. (2006). *Migrant workers in Canada: A review of the Canadian Seasonal Agricultural Workers Program*. Policy Brief. Ottawa, ON: The North-South Institute. Retrieved from http://www.nsi-ins.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/2006-Migrant-Workers-in-Canada-A-review-of-the-Canadian-Seasonal-Agricultural-Workers-Program.pdf

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2012). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Russo, R. M. (2011). Temporarily unchained: The drive to unionize foreign seasonal agricultural workers in Canada – A comment on Greenway Farms and UFCW. *BC Studies, 169*(Spring), 131-141.

Saks, A. M., Salas, E., & Lewis, P. (2014). The transfer of training. *International Journal of Training and Development, 18*(2), 81-83.

Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001, February). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 471-479.

Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., & Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2012). The science of training and development in organizations: What matters in practice. *Organizational Training and Development, 13*(2), 74-101.

Salazar, M. K., Napolitano, M., Scherer, J. A., & McCauley, L. A. (2004). Hispanic adolescent farmworkers' perceptions associated with pesticide exposure. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 26*(2), 146-166.

Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission (2014, November 6). *Human rights for everyone*. Retrieved from http://saskatchewanhumanrights.ca/+pub/documents/publications/SHRC_Human%20Rights.pdf

Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety. (2007). *The Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993, c.34. Chapter O-1.1*. WorkSafe Saskatchewan. Regina, Canada: The Queen's Printer.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety (54/2009). *The Occupational Health and Safety Regulations, 1996. Chapter O-1.1 Reg. 1*. WorkSafe Saskatchewan. Regina, Canada: The Queen's Printer.

Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety (2011). *Health and safety of workers. Orientation and training: a guide for employers*. Revised May 2011. Occupational health and safety, Work Safe Saskatchewan. Regina, Canada: The Queen's Printer. Retrieved from http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/details.cfm?p=69143

Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board. (2015). *The Workers' Compensation Act, 2013 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan 2013*. Regina, Canada: The Queen's Printer. Retrieved from http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/W17-11.pdf

Sass, R. (1981, February). Worker Rights and Occupational Health Committees: Saskatchewan legislation, historical background, and day-to-day experience. Regina, Canada: Saskatchewan Labour-Occupational Health and Safety Branch.

Sass, R. (1986). The workers' right to know, participate and refuse hazardous work: A manifesto right. *Journal of Business Ethics, 5*(2), 129-136.

Sass, R. (1995). The work environment board and the limits of social democracy. In J. Harding (Ed.), *Social policy and social justice* (pp. 53-83). Waterloo, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Satzewich, V., & Liodakis, N. (2010). *'Race' and ethnicity in Canada: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sawchuk, P. H., & Kempf, A. (2008). Guest worker programs and Canada: Towards a foundation for understanding the complex pedagogies of transnational labour. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 20*(7/8), 492-502.

Sbicca, J. (2012). Elite and marginalised actors in toxic treadmills: Challenging the power of the state, military, and economy. *Environmental Politics, 21*(3), 467-485.

Schenker, M. (2010). A global perspective of migration and occupational health. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 53*(4), 329-337.

Schwandt, T. A. (2007). The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

SCLC Secretariat of the Commission for Labor Cooperation (2002). *Protection of migrant agricultural workers in Canada, Mexico and the United States*. Washington, DC: Commission for Labor Cooperation. Retrieved from http://www.naalc.org/english/pdf/study4.pdf

Sharma, M., & Romas, J. (2012). *Theoretical foundations of health education and health promotion*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Shreck, A., Getz, C., & Feenstra, G. (2006). Social sustainability, farm labor, and organic agriculture: Findings from an exploratory analysis. *Agriculture and Human Values, 23*(4), 439-449.

Simonds, L. M., Camic, P. M., & Causey, A. (2012). Using focused ethnography in psychological research. In H. Cooper (Ed.). *APA handbook of research methods in psychology. Vol. 2 Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological and biological* (pp. 157-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Smart, J. (1997). Borrowed men on borrowed time: Globalization, labour migration and local economies in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Regional Science, 20*(1-2), 141-155.

Smith, D. (2011). *Consulted to death: How Canada's workplace health and safety system fails workers*. Winnipeg, Canada: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Snipes, S. H., Thompson, B., O'Connor, K., Shell-Duncan, B., King D., & Herrera, A. P. (2009). "Pesticides protect the fruit, but not the people". Using community-based ethnography to understand farmworker pesticide-exposure risks. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(S3), S616-S621.

Spears, C. R., Summers, P. Y., Spencer, K. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2012). Informal occupational safety information exchange among Latino migrant and seasonal farmworkers. *Journal of Agromedicine, 17*(4), 415-420.

Spencer, B., & Kelly, J. (2013). *Work and learning*: *An introduction*. Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing, Co.

Spencer, B., & Lange, E. (2014). *The purposes of adult education: An introduction*. (3rd ed). Toronto, Canada: Thompson Educational Pub. Inc.

Spitzer, M. A., Withford, F., & Frick, M. (1994, October). Migrant farmworker training needs and the pesticide workers protection standards. *Journal of Extension, 32*(3), 1-6.

Stallones, L., Vela, A. M. S., Sample, P., Bigelow, P., & Rosales, M. (2009). Perspectives on safety among migrant and seasonal farmworkers in the United States and Mexico: A qualitative field study. *The Journal of Rural health*, *25*(2), 219-225.

Strigini, P. (1982). On the political economy of risk: Farmworkers, pesticides, and dollars. *International Journal of Health Services*, *12*(2), 263-292.

Swanberg, J. E, Clouser, J. M, Browning, S.R., Westneat, S. C., & Marsh, M. K. (2013). Occupational health among Latino horse and crop workers in Kentucky: The role of work organization factors. *Journal of Agromedicine, 18*(4), 312-325.

Szell, G. (2014). Regional and local sustainable development. *International Review of Sociology, 24*(1), 4-12.

Taylor, A. K., & Murray, L. R. (2009). Occupational safety and health. In B. S. Levy & V. W. Sidel (Eds.), *Social injustice and public health* (pp. 337-356). New York, NY: American Public Health Association-Oxford University Press.

Taylor, E. W. (2005). Learning. In L. M. English (Ed.). *International encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 348-353). New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Thierry, A. D., & Snipes, S. M. (2015). Why do farmworkers delay treatment after debilitating injuries? Thematic analysis explains if, when, and why farmworkers were treated for injuries. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, *58*(2), 178-192.

Third World Network & Sociedad Científica Latinoamericana de Agroecología. Agroecology: Key concepts, principles and practices. Penang, Malaysia: TWN-SOCLA. Retrieved from http://agroeco.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Agroecology-training-manual-TWN-SOCLA.pdf

Thomas, R. J. (1985). *Citizenship, gender, and work: Social organization of industrial agriculture*. London, England: University of California Press.

Tight, M. (2002). *Key concepts in adult education and training.* London, GB: RoutledgeFalmer-Taylor & Francis Group.

Timmermann, C., & Félix, G. F. (2015). Agroecology as a vehicle for contributive justice. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *3*(32), 523-538.

Trajkovski, S., & Loosemore, M. (2006). Safety implications of low-English proficiency among migrant construction site operatives. *International Journal of Project Management, 24*(5), 446-452.

Trumper, R., & Wong, L. L. (1997). Racialization and genderization: The Canadian state, immigrants, and temporary workers. In B. S. Bolaria and R. Von Elling-Bolaria (Eds.), *International Labour Migrations* (pp. 153-191). New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Turay, T. M. (2005). Popular education. In L. M. English (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of adult education* (pp. 480-484). New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

UFCW United Food and Commercial Workers Canada (2015). The status of migrant farm workers in Canada. UFCW Canada and the Agriculture Workers Alliance (AWA). Canada. Retrieved from http://www.ufcw.ca/templates/ufcwcanada/images/directions15/october/1586/MigrantWorkersReport2015_EN_email.pdf

Valarezo, G. (2007). Out of necessity and into the field: Migrant farmworkers in St. Rémi, Quebec. (Master's thesis Department of Geography). Queen's University. Kingston, ON. Retrieved from https://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/1974/1087/1/Valarezo_Giselle_V_200710_MA.pdf

Velázquez, L. C. (1996). Voices from the fields: Community-based migrant education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 70*(Summer), 27-35.

Viveros-Guzmán, A., & Bartlett, K. (2016). Seasonal and migrant workers: Exposures to seasonal and migrant workers in agriculture. National Summit on the Control of Agricultural Injuries and Health in Canada. June 7, 2016. Topic Summaries. Saskatoon, SK, Canada: Agrivita Canada, Canadian Centre for Health and Safety in Agriculture, CREOD, Centre for Research Expertise in Occupational Disease.

Viveros-Guzmán, A., & Gertler, M. (2015). Latino farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Language barriers and health and safety. *Journal of Agromedicine, 20*(3), 341-348.

Vogel, F. (2003). Agricultural sustainability: The human dimension. *Statistical Journal of the United Nations, 20*(1), 1-8.

Walker, C. (1997). NAFTA and occupational health: A Canadian perspective. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 18*(3), 325-333.

Walker, P. A. (2005). Political ecology: Where is the ecology? *Progress in Human Geography, 29*(1), 73-82.

Wallerstein, N. (1992). Powerlessness, empowerment, and health: Implications for health promotion programs. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 6*(3), 197-205.

Wallerstein, N., & Sanchez-Merki, V. (1994). Freirean praxis in health education: Research results from an adolescent prevention program. *Health Education Research Theory & Practice, 9*(1), 105-118.

Wallerstein, N., & Weinger, M. (1992). Health and safety education for worker empowerment. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 22*(5), 619-635.

Walters, V. (1985). The politics of occupational health and safety: Interviews with workers' health and safety representatives and company doctors. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology, 22*(1), 57-79.

Wang, G., McGrath, B. B., & Watts, C. (2010). Health care transitions among youth with disabilities or special health care needs: An ecological approach. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing, 25*(6), 505-550.

WCED World Commission on Environment and Development (1988). *Our common future*. Oxford, GB: Oxford University Press.

Weinstock, D., & Slatin, C. (2012). Learning to take action: The goals of health and safety training. *New Solutions, 23*(3), 255-267.

WHO World Health Organization (1995). Global strategy on occupational health for all: The way to health at work. Recommendation of the Second Meeting of the WHO Collaborating Centre on Occupational Health. October 11-14, 1994 Beijing, China. Geneva: WHO. January 27, 2015 Retrieved from http://www.who.int/occupational_health/en/oehstrategy.pdf?ua=1

Youngman, F. (1996). Towards a political economy of adult education and development in Botswana. In P. Wangoola & F. Youngman (Eds.), *Towards a transformative political economy of adult education* (pp. 191-222). DeKalb, IL: LEPS Press.

Zachrison, M. (2014). Invisible voices: Understanding the sociocultural influences on adult migrants' second language learning and communicative interaction. (Doctoral dissertation in Ethnic and Migration Studies, Linköping University & Malmö University). Malmö Studies in International Migration and Ethnic Relations No. 12. Linköping Studies in Art and Sciences No. 626. Holmbergs, Malmö, Sweden. Retrieved from https://dspace.mah.se/handle/2043/17240

Ziesman, A. (2013). Will work for food: Canada's agricultural industry and the recruitment of South East Asian temporary migrant workers. (Master's thesis Department of Sociology and International Development). The University of Guelph. Guelph, ON. Retrieved from https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10214/6763/Ziesman_Alia_201305_MA.pdf?sequence=1

Appendix A. Farmworker One-on-One Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled, "Latino Seasonal Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Sociocultural Dimensions of Labour and Agricultural Sustainability." Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have.

Research Team:

Dr. Michael Gertler (Research Supervisor)
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Saskatchewan
101 Diefenbaker Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5B8
Office: (306) 966-8501
michael.gertler@usask.ca

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán (Doctoral student)
School of Environment and Sustainability
University of Saskatchewan
Room 335, Kirk Hall 117
Science Place, Saskatoon,
SK S7N 5C8
Office: (306) 966-XXXX
arv460@mail.usask.ca

Purpose and Procedure: The general purpose of this research is to explore how education, language skills, employment histories, working practices, and program regulations and requirements affect migrant farmworkers and farmers. We would also like your help in identifying strengths and weaknesses of the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) (and related programs), and to hear your thoughts as to possible solutions. This interview should last 45 to 90 minutes. We are asking for your consent to participate in the interview.

Potential Benefits: Your interview will assist us to understand how migrant farmworkers contribute to Saskatchewan agriculture and how migrant farm labour programs work from the perspective of various participants. Your responses will also assist us in proposing education, training, and communication strategies useful for workers, farmers, and civil servants. Although there are no obvious direct benefits to participating in the study, we hope that farmers and workers will benefit from the recommendations we will be able to make based on this research.

Potential Risks: Participation in this interview presents "minimal risk" (according to the criteria of the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board). We are aware of the sensitivity of your position and have taken steps to reduce the possibility that there will be any negative implications for you as an employee. This includes securing prior permission from the farm owner in cases where we are interviewing farmworkers at their workplace.

Storage of Data: All interview records such as our field notes, contact information, digital photographs, audio recordings and written transcriptions will be securely stored in office of the senior researcher (Michael Gertler) at the University of Saskatchewan for a minimum of five years. Any data that is being discarded after that period will be shredded or erased.

Confidentiality: All interview materials will be treated as confidential. Neither your name, hometown, place of work, nor any other identifying information will appear in any publication or presentation. Only the research team named above will have access to the recorded interview and the written transcript. Your employer will not have access to any of this information.

Data will be presented in such a way as to disguise the source. A person may be identified with a pseudonym, with a letter-number code, or in general terms, for example, "One male/female farmworker said…."

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary, and you can answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. There is no guarantee that you will personally benefit from your involvement. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the research project for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed at your request. You can request that the digital recorder be turned off at any point or that it not to be turned on at all. You can also request that we omit/delete specific comments.

Questions: If you have any questions concerning the research project, please feel free to ask at any point. You are also free to contact the researchers at the numbers provided above if you have any questions. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board on April 10th, 2012. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the committee through the Ethics Office (306-966-2084). Out of town participants may call collect.

Follow-Up: Upon request, the researchers will provide an oral presentation summarizing the research results. A brief written summary report will also be available in English or in Spanish to those who request it.

Consent to Participate: "I have read and understood the description provided and the interviewer has also read aloud this Consent Form in Spanish. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. I consent to participate in the research project, understanding that I may withdraw my consent at any time. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records."

Oral Consent: If on the other hand the consent has been obtained orally, this should be recorded. For example, the Consent Form dated, and signed by the researcher(s) indicating that "I read and explained this Consent Form to the participant before receiving the participant's consent, and the participant had knowledge of its contents and appeared to understand it." In addition, consent may be audio or video recorded.

Name of Participant	*Researcher's Signature*	*Date*

Appendix B. Consentimiento de Entrevista Individual con Trabajadores(as)

Esta usted cordialmente invitado a participar en un proyecto de tesis titulado: "Trabajadores Latinos de Temporada Agrícola en Saskatchewan: Aspectos Socioculturales del Trabajo y Sostenibilidad Agrícolas". Por favor lea este documento cuidadosamente y tenga la confianza de preguntar si tuviera algunas dudas.

Equipo de Trabajo:

Dr. Michael Gertler (Supervisor de tesis)
Profesor Asociado, Departamento de Sociología, Universidad de Saskatchewan
101 Diefenbaker Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5B8
Oficina: (306) 966-8501
michael.gertler@usask.ca

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán (Estudiante de doctorado). Escuela de Estudios Ambientales y Sostenibilidad, Universidad de Saskatchewan
Oficina 335, Kirk Hall 117 Science Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5C8
Oficina: (306) 966-XXXX
arv460@mail.usask.ca

Propósito y Procedimiento: El propósito general de este estudio es explorar las maneras en que la educación, las habilidades lingüísticas, el historial de empleo, el trabajo en sí, y las regulaciones y requisitos del Programa de Trabajadores Agrícolas Temporales (PTAT) influyen en los trabajadores agrícolas migrantes y en los granjeros. Otro propósito es pedirle su opinión acerca del lado bueno y problemático del PTAT (o programas similares). También nos gustaría que nos diga como cree usted que podrían solucionarse los problemas que usted cree que existen. Esta entrevista puede tardar entre media hora y una hora y media. Con este documento queremos pedirle su consentimiento (permiso) para que nos conceda una entrevista con usted.

Posibles Beneficios: Sus respuestas a nuestras preguntas nos ayudarán en lo siguiente: 1) saber como los trabajadores agrícolas migrantes contribuyen a desarrollar la agricultura en Saskatchewan; 2) saber como funcionan los programas internacionales de migración de la mano de obra en agricultura; y 3) proponer una manera de como brindar educación, capacitación y mejorar la comunicación entre trabajadores, granjeros y servidores públicos en relación al programa. Aunque este estudio no le brindara beneficios directos por participar en la entrevista, esperamos que nuestras recomendaciones para mejorar el programa PTAT en Saskatchewan influyan para bien de los granjeros y trabajadores.

Posibles Riesgos: De acuerdo con la revisión ética hecha por la junta académica de revisiones éticas y del comportamiento; esta entrevista representa un "riesgo mínimo" para usted. Dado que estamos conscientes de las circunstancias un tanto delicadas por las que usted pasa como empleado temporal en Canadá; hemos tomado las precauciones necesarias para minimizar la posibilidad de que esta entrevista le pudiera repercutir negativamente. Por ejemplo, en caso de que la entrevista se lleve a cabo en su centro de trabajo, a su patrón se le pedirá permiso con anticipación para poder entrevistarlo a usted como trabajador.

Resguardo de la Información: Toda la información personal que usted nos proporcione, lo que escribamos en nuestros cuadernos, las grabaciones de su voz al ser entrevistado y la transcripción del audio a forma escrita se guardarán en un lugar seguro en la oficina del profesor Michael Gertler en la Universidad de Saskatchewan durante un periodo mínimo de cinco años.

Después de estos cinco años destruiremos toda la información que usted proporcionó, así como nuestras notas, grabaciones y la conversión del audio a forma escrita.

Confidencialidad: Toda la información que usted nos proporcione será manejada confidencialmente. De esta manera, su nombre, su estado de procedencia en México, el nombre de su centro de trabajo, o cualquier otra información que pudiera identificarlo a usted no aparecerán en ninguna publicación o presentación. Únicamente el equipo de investigación (el profesor Michael Gertler y Arcadio Viveros) es quien tendrá acceso a las grabaciones de las entrevistas y sus versiones escritas. Su empleador (patrón) no tendrá acceso a ningún tipo de información. La información será presentada de manera tal que no se pueda saber quién la proporciona. Un nombre falso, o una combinación de números y letras, será asignado a cada entrevistado; además, también podemos únicamente escribir "una trabajadora agrícola mencionó…", "un trabajador agrícola mencionó…", para que no se sepan los nombres verdaderos de los entrevistados.

Derecho a Retractarse: Su participación es voluntaria y tiene la libertad de contestar únicamente las preguntas que usted quiera. Cabe aclarar que no podemos garantizar que la relación con nosotros le beneficie directamente. La información que usted proporcione se mantendrá en estricta confidencialidad y será estudiada solo por el equipo de investigación (el profesor Gertler y Arcadio Viveros). Le informamos que usted tiene el derecho de abstenerse de participar en este proyecto de investigación cuando usted así lo decida sin recibir reclamo alguno. Si decidiera abstenerse de participar en este proyecto de investigación, la información que nos proporcione será destruida si usted así nos lo pide. Cuando usted lo indique; la grabadora se apagará y puede pedir que no se prenda en ningún momento. Le recordamos que también puede pedir que borremos ciertos comentarios que ya haya hecho durante la entrevista.

Preguntas: Si tiene algunas preguntas acerca de este proyecto de investigación, tenga la plena confianza de hacerlas en cualquier momento comunicándose con los investigadores a los números anotados previamente. Este proyecto de investigación ha sido aprobado por sus cualidades éticas por la Junta de Investigación en Conducta y Ética de la Universidad de Saskatchewan el día 10 de abril del 2012. Cualquier pregunta acerca de tus derechos como participante podrá dirigirla a la Junta de Ética, por medio de la Oficina de Ética de la Universidad de Saskatchewan (306-966-2084). Si vive fuera de la ciudad de Saskatoon puede llamar por cobrar con cargo a la universidad.

Actividades de Seguimiento: Si usted nos lo pidiera, podemos hacerle una presentación breve de los resultados de esta investigación o también si así lo quisiera podemos hacerle llegar un resumen corto de los resultados que estará disponible tanto en inglés como en español.

Consentimiento de Participación: "He leído y entendido la descripción de este documento de consentimiento y el entrevistador me lo ha leído en voz alta en español. He tenido también la oportunidad de hacer preguntas las cuales han sido respondidas. Con esto doy mi consentimiento de participar en este proyecto de investigación quedándome claro que puedo retractarme o abstenerme de participar si así yo lo decidiera. Una copia de este Documento de Consentimiento me ha sido proporcionada para mi propio resguardo."

Consentimiento Oral: Si por otro lado, el consentimiento ha sido obtenido oralmente, éste debe registrarse. Por ejemplo, el Formato de Consentimiento fechado y firmado por el/los investigadores indicando que “leí y expliqué este Formato de Consentimiento al participante antes de obtener su consentimiento, dándose así por enterado del contenido y entendimiento de dicho formato de consentimiento. Adicionalmente, el consentimiento podría ser grabado en audio o video.

_____ _____

Nombre del Participante Nombre y Firma del Investigador

_____

Fecha

Appendix C. Farmworker Group Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled, "Latino Seasonal Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Sociocultural Dimensions of Labour and Agricultural Sustainability." Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have.

Research Team:

Dr. Michael Gertler (Research Supervisor)
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Saskatchewan
101 Diefenbaker Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5B8
Office: (306) 966-8501
michael.gertler@usask.ca

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán (Doctoral student)
School of Environment and Sustainability
University of Saskatchewan
Room 335, Kirk Hall 117 Science Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5C8
Office: (306) 966-XXXX
arv460@mail.usask.ca

Purpose and Procedure: The general purpose of this research is to explore how education, language skills, employment histories, working practices, and program regulations and requirements affect migrant farmworkers and farmers. We would also like your help in identifying strengths and weaknesses of the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) (and related programs), and to hear your thoughts as to possible solutions. This group interview should last 60 to 90 minutes. We are asking for your consent to participate in the interview.

Potential Benefits: Your interview will assist us to understand how migrant farmworkers contribute to Saskatchewan agriculture and how migrant farm labour programs work from the perspective of various participants. Your responses will also assist us in proposing education, training, and communication strategies useful for workers, farmers, and civil servants. Although there are no obvious direct benefits to participating in the study, we hope that farmers and farmworkers will benefit from the recommendations we will be able to make based on this research.

Potential Risks: Participation in this interview presents "minimal risk" (according to the criteria of the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board). We are aware of the sensitivity of your position and have taken steps to reduce the possibility that there will be any negative implications for you as an employee. This includes securing prior permission from the farm owner in cases where we are interviewing workers at their workplace.

Storage of Data: All interview records such as our field notes, contact information, digital photographs, audio recordings and written transcriptions will be securely stored in office of the senior researcher (Michael Gertler) at the University of Saskatchewan for a minimum of five years. Any data that is being discarded after that period will be shredded or erased.

Confidentiality: All interview materials will be treated as confidential. No identifying information will be included in any publication or presentation (not your name, hometown, place of work, nor any other identifying information). Only the research team named above will have access to the recorded interview and the written transcript.

Your employer will not have access to any of this information. Data will be presented in such a way as to disguise the source. A person may be identified with a pseudonym, with a letter-number code, or in general terms, for example, "One male/female farmworker said…." Please be aware that you are participating in a small group interview and the other participants will hear your answers. We will make every effort to safeguard the confidentiality of the conversations, however we cannot guarantee that your co-workers participating in the group interview will also do so. Please respect the confidentiality of the other group members by not disclosing the contents of this discussion outside the group.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary, and you can answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. There is no guarantee that you will personally benefit from your involvement. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the research project for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed at your request. You can request that the digital recorder be turned off at any point or that it not to be turned on at all. You can also request that we omit/delete specific comments.

Questions: If you have any questions concerning the research project, please feel free to ask at any point. You are also free to contact the researchers at the numbers provided above if you have any questions. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board on April 10th, 2012. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the committee through the Ethics Office (306-966-2084). Out of town participants may call collect.

Follow-Up: Upon request, the researchers will provide an oral presentation summarizing the research results. A brief written summary report will also be available in English or in Spanish to those who request it.

Consent to Participate: "I have read and understood the description provided and the interviewer has also read aloud this Consent Form in Spanish. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. I consent to participate in the research project, understanding that I may withdraw my consent at any time. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records."

Oral Consent: If on the other hand the consent has been obtained orally, this should be recorded. For example, the Consent Form dated, and signed by the researcher(s) indicating that "I read and explained this Consent Form to the participant before receiving the participant's consent, and the participant had knowledge of its contents and appeared to understand it." In addition, consent may be audio or video recorded.

Name of Participant	*Researcher's Signature*	*Date*

Appendix D. Consentimiento de Entrevista con Grupos de Trabajadores(as)

Esta usted cordialmente invitado a participar en un proyecto de tesis titulado: "Trabajadores Latinos de Temporada Agrícola en Saskatchewan: Aspectos Socioculturales del Trabajo y Sostenibilidad Agrícolas". Por favor lea este documento cuidadosamente y tenga la confianza de preguntar si tuviera algunas dudas.

Equipo de Trabajo:

Dr. Michael Gertler
(Supervisor de tesis)
Profesor Asociado, Departamento de Sociología, Universidad de Saskatchewan
101 Diefenbaker Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5B8
Oficina: (306) 966-8501
michael.gertler@usask.ca

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán
(Estudiante de doctorado). Escuela de Estudios Ambientales y Sostenibilidad
Universidad de Saskatchewan
Oficina 335, Kirk Hall 117 Science Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5C8
Oficina: (306) 966-XXXX
arv460@mail.usask.ca

Propósito y Procedimiento: El propósito general de este estudio es explorar las maneras en que la educación, las habilidades lingüísticas, el historial de empleo, el trabajo en sí, y las regulaciones y requisitos del Programa de Trabajadores Agrícolas Temporales (PTAT) influyen en los trabajadores agrícolas migrantes y en los granjeros. Otro propósito es pedirle su opinión acerca del lado bueno y problemático del PTAT (o programas similares). También nos gustaría que nos diga como cree usted que podrían solucionarse los problemas que usted cree que existen. Esta entrevista puede tardar entre media hora y una hora y media. Con este documento queremos pedirle su consentimiento (permiso) para que nos conceda una entrevista con usted.

Posibles Beneficios: Sus respuestas a nuestras preguntas nos ayudarán en lo siguiente: 1) saber como los trabajadores agrícolas migrantes contribuyen a desarrollar la agricultura en Saskatchewan; 2) saber como funcionan los programas internacionales de migración de la mano de obra en agricultura; y 3) proponer una manera de como brindar educación, capacitación y mejorar la comunicación entre trabajadores, granjeros y servidores públicos en relación al programa. Aunque este estudio no le brindara beneficios directos por participar en la entrevista, esperamos que nuestras recomendaciones para mejorar el programa PTAT en Saskatchewan influyan para bien de los granjeros y trabajadores.

Posibles Riesgos: De acuerdo con la revisión ética hecha por la junta académica de revisiones éticas y del comportamiento; esta entrevista representa un "riesgo mínimo" para usted. Dado que estamos conscientes de las circunstancias un tanto delicadas por las que usted pasa como empleado temporal en Canadá; hemos tomado las precauciones necesarias para minimizar la posibilidad de que esta entrevista le pudiera repercutir negativamente. Por ejemplo, en caso de que la entrevista se lleve a cabo en su centro de trabajo, a su patrón se le pedirá permiso con anticipación para poder entrevistarlo a usted como trabajador.

Resguardo de la Información: Toda la información personal que usted nos proporcione, lo que escribamos en nuestros cuadernos, las grabaciones de su voz al ser entrevistado y la transcripción del audio a forma escrita se guardarán en un lugar seguro en la oficina del profesor Michael

Gertler en la Universidad de Saskatchewan durante un periodo mínimo de cinco años. Después de estos cinco años destruiremos toda la información que usted proporciono, así como nuestras notas, grabaciones y la conversión del audio a forma escrita.

Confidencialidad: Toda la información que usted nos proporcione será manejada confidencialmente. De esta manera, su nombre, su estado de procedencia en México, el nombre de su centro de trabajo, o cualquier otra información que pudiera identificarlo a usted no aparecerán en ninguna publicación o presentación. Únicamente el equipo de investigación (el profesor Michael Gertler y Arcadio Viveros) es quien tendrá acceso a las grabaciones de las entrevistas y sus versiones escritas. Su empleador (patrón) no tendrá acceso a ningún tipo de información. La información será presentada de manera tal que no se pueda saber quién la proporciona. Un nombre falso, o una combinación de números y letras, será asignado a cada entrevistado; además, también podemos únicamente escribir "una trabajadora agrícola mencionó…", "un trabajador agrícola mencionó…", para que no se sepan los nombres verdaderos de los entrevistados.

Por favor tenga en mente que usted esta participando en una entrevista hecha con un grupo pequeño cuyos participantes podrán escuchar sus respuestas. Nosotros haremos todo lo posible para mantener la confidencialidad de las conversaciones, aunque le aclaramos que no podemos garantizar que sus compañeros de trabajo también harán lo mismo. Por consiguiente, le pedimos por favor que respete la confidencialidad de los miembros del grupo entrevistado y no comente nada con nadie de lo que escuchó en la reunión.

Derecho a Retractarse: Su participación es voluntaria y tiene la libertad de contestar únicamente las preguntas que usted quiera. Cabe aclarar que no podemos garantizar que la relación con nosotros le beneficie directamente. La información que usted proporcione se mantendrá en estricta confidencialidad y será estudiada solo por el equipo de investigación (el profesor Gertler y Arcadio Viveros). Le informamos que usted tiene el derecho de abstenerse de participar en este proyecto de investigación cuando usted así lo decida sin recibir reclamo alguno. Si decidiera abstenerse de participar en este proyecto de investigación, la información que nos proporcione será destruida si usted así nos lo pide. Cuando usted lo indique; la grabadora se apagará y puede pedir que no se prenda en ningún momento. Le recordamos que también puede pedir que borremos ciertos comentarios que ya haya hecho durante la entrevista.

Preguntas: Si tiene algunas preguntas acerca de este proyecto de investigación, tenga la plena confianza de hacerlas en cualquier momento comunicándose con los investigadores a los números anotados previamente. Este proyecto de investigación ha sido aprobado por sus cualidades éticas por la Junta de Investigación en Conducta y Ética de la Universidad de Saskatchewan el día 10 de abril del 2012. Cualquier pregunta acerca de tus derechos como participante podrá dirigirla a la Junta de Ética, por medio de la Oficina de Ética de la Universidad de Saskatchewan (306-966-2084). Si vive fuera de la ciudad de Saskatoon puede llamar por cobrar con cargo a la universidad.

Actividades de Seguimiento: Si usted nos lo pidiera, podemos hacerle una presentación breve de los resultados de esta investigación o también si así lo quisiera podemos hacerle llegar un resumen corto de los resultados que estará disponible tanto en inglés como en español.

Consentimiento de Participación: “He leído y entendido la descripción de este documento de consentimiento y el entrevistador me lo ha leído en voz alta en español. He tenido también la oportunidad de hacer preguntas las cuales han sido respondidas. Con esto doy mi consentimiento de participar en este proyecto de investigación quedándome claro que puedo retractarme o abstenerme de participar si así yo lo decidiera. Una copia de este Documento de Consentimiento me ha sido proporcionada para mi propio resguardo.”

Consentimiento Oral: Si por otro lado, el consentimiento ha sido obtenido oralmente, éste debe registrarse. Por ejemplo, el Formato de Consentimiento fechado y firmado por el/los investigadores indicando que “leí y expliqué este Formato de Consentimiento al participante antes de obtener su consentimiento, dándose así por enterado del contenido y entendimiento de dicho formato de consentimiento. Adicionalmente, el consentimiento podría ser grabado en audio o video.

_____ _____

Nombre del Participante Nombre y Firma del Estudiante

_____

Fecha

Appendix E. Interview Consent Form for Farmers/Employers

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled, *Latino Seasonal Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Sociocultural Dimensions of Labour and Agricultural Sustainability*. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have.

Research Team:

Dr. Michael Gertler (Research Supervisor)
Associate Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Saskatchewan
101 Diefenbaker Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5B8
Office: (306) 966-8501
michael.gertler@usask.ca

Arcadio Viveros Guzmán (Doctoral student)
School of Environment and Sustainability
University of Saskatchewan
Room 335, Kirk Hall 117 Science Place,
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5C8
Office: (306) 966-XXXX
arv460@mail.usask.ca

Purpose and Procedure: The general purpose of this research is to explore how education, language skills, employment histories, working practices, and program regulations and requirements affect migrant farmworkers and farmers. We would also like your help in identifying strengths and weaknesses of the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program (SAWP) (and related programs), and to hear your thoughts as to possible solutions. This interview should last 30 to 75 minutes. We are asking for your consent to participate in the interview.

Potential Benefits: Your interview will assist us to understand how migrant farmworkers contribute to Saskatchewan agriculture and how migrant farm labour programs work from the perspective of various participants. Your responses will also assist us in proposing education, training, and communication strategies useful for workers, farmers, and civil servants. Although there are no obvious direct benefits to participating in the study, we hope that farmers and workers will benefit from the recommendations we will be able to make based on this research.

Potential Risks: Participation in this interview presents "minimal risk" (according to the criteria of the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board).

Storage of Data: All interview records such as our field notes, contact information, digital photographs, audio recordings and written transcriptions will be securely stored in office of the senior researcher (Dr. Michael Gertler) at the University of Saskatchewan for a minimum of five years. Any data that is being discarded after that period will be shredded or erased.

Confidentiality: All interview materials will be treated as confidential. Neither your name nor any other personal identifying information will appear in any publication or presentation. Only the research team named above will have access to the recorded interview and the written transcript. Data will be presented in such a way as to disguise the source. A person may be identified with a pseudonym, with a letter-number code, or in general terms, for example, "One farmer-employer/interviewee said…."

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary, and you can answer only those questions that you are comfortable with. There is no guarantee that you will personally benefit from your involvement. The information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team. You may withdraw from the research project for any reason, at any time, without penalty of any sort. If you withdraw from the research project at any time, any data that you have contributed will be destroyed at your request. You can request that the digital recorder be turned off at any point or that it not to be turned on at all. You can also request that we omit/delete specific comments.

Questions: If you have any questions concerning the research project, please feel free to ask at any point. You are also free to contact the researchers at the numbers provided above if you have any questions. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board on April 10th, 2012. Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the committee through the Ethics Office (306-966-2084). Out of town participants may call collect.

Follow-Up: Upon request, the researchers will provide a presentation summarizing the research results. A written summary report will also be available to those who request it. A digital version of the doctoral thesis for which this data is being collected will be available through the library at the University of Saskatchewan.

Consent to Participate: I have read and understood the description provided. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. I consent to participate in the research project, understanding that I may withdraw my consent at any time. A copy of this Consent Form has been given to me for my records.

_____	_____
Name of Participant	Date
_____	_____
Signature of Participant	Signature and Name of Researcher

Appendix F. Interview Topic Guides

Topic Guide for Latino Migrant Farmworker Interviews

1. Previous work experience
2. Previous preparation/training
3. Activities/tasks in the workplace
4. Dangerous or unhealthy tasks
5. Occupational health and safety and occupational health and safety training/orientation
    a. Personal protective equipment
    b. Pesticides and pesticide application training
    c. Beliefs and habits
6. Improvement of workplace health and safety
7. Work days and work schedules
    a. Hours of work
8. Hardest part about living in Saskatchewan
9. Communication challenges
    a. Language barriers (English and Spanish)
    b. Strategies to deal with language barriers
    c. Written communication
10. Training/information needs
11. Experiences with accessing health services

Topic Guide for Farmers/Employers Interviews

1. Farm type and sector
2. Reasons for hiring Latino migrant farmworkers
3. Implications for your enterprise if Latino migrant farmworkers were not available
4. Major challenges with respect to working with Latino migrant farmworkers
5. Training needs of Latino migrant farmworkers
6. Major challenges in terms of keeping Latino migrant farmworkers safe and healthy in the workplace

Topic Guide for Interviews with OHS Civil Servants, former Canadian Farmworkers, and Advocates

1. Major challenges with respect to working with Latino migrant farmworkers and their employers
    a. OHS, Communication, and culture
2. Recommendations to address those challenges

Appendix G. Transcription Confidentiality Agreement

Interview Transcripts

Research project entitled: “Latino Seasonal Farmworkers in Saskatchewan: Sociocultural Dimensions of Labour and Agricultural Sustainability.”

In signing this form, I agree to maintain confidential all information handled in the process of entering and transcribing the information collected from the interview conducted on the date indicated below. Once the research team (Arcadio Viveros Guzmán and/or Dr. Michael Gertler) receives my transcription, I will immediately delete/destroy any related information, data, or transcriptions kept on my password-protected computer or on paper.

_____

Assigned Code(s) or Names of Interviewees

_____ _____

Name and Signature of Transcriptionist Date

Appendix H. OHS and Training Regulations in Saskatchewan (Applicable to 2012)

PART I: Preliminary Matters*

"(p) "Occupational health and safety" means (p. 4-5):
(i) the promotion and maintenance of the highest degree of physical, mental and social wellbeing of workers;
(ii) the prevention among workers of ill health caused by their working conditions;
(iii) the protection of workers in their employment from factors adverse to their health;
(iv) the placing and maintenance of workers in working environments that are adapted to their individual physiological and psychological conditions; and
(v) the promotion and maintenance of a working environment that is free of harassment;"

*From: Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety. (2007). *The Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993, c.34. Chapter O-1.1*. WorkSafe Saskatchewan. Regina, Canada: The Queens Printer.

PART I: Preliminary Matters**

"train" means to give information and explanation to a worker with respect to a particular subject-matter and require a practical demonstration that the worker has acquired knowledge or skill related to the subject-matter;" (p. 10)

PART III: General Duties (p. 15)**

"General duties of employers (p. 15)
12 The duties of an employer at a place of employment include (p. 15):
(c) the provision of any information, instruction, training and supervision that is necessary to protect the health and safety of workers at work […].

"General duties of workers (p. 15)
13 A worker shall:
(a) use the safeguards, safety appliances and personal protective equipment provided in accordance with these regulations and any other regulations made pursuant to the Act; and
(b) follow the safe work practices and procedures required by or developed pursuant to these regulations and any other regulations made pursuant to the Act."
4 Oct 96 cO-1.1 Reg 1 s13.

"Supervision of work (p. 16-17)
17(1) An employer or contractor shall ensure that:
(a) all work at a place of employment is sufficiently and competently supervised; p. 16
(b) supervisors have sufficient knowledge of all of the following with respect to matters that are within the scope of the supervisor's responsibility:
(i) the Act and any regulations made pursuant to the Act that apply to the place of employment;"
"(ii) any occupational health and safety program at the place of employment;

(iii) the safe handling, use, storage, production and disposal of chemical and biological substances;
(iv) the need for, and safe use of, personal protective equipment; (v) emergency procedures required by these regulations;
(vi) any other matters that are necessary to ensure the health and safety of workers under their direction; and

(c) supervisors comply with the Act and any regulations made pursuant to the Act that apply to the place of employment and ensure that the workers under their direction comply with the Act and those regulations.

(2) A supervisor shall ensure that the workers under the supervisor's direction comply with the Act and any regulations made pursuant to the Act that apply to the place of employment."

4 Oct 96 cO-1.1 Reg 1 s17. (pp. 16-17)

"Training of workers (Section 19, p. 17-18):

19(1) An employer shall ensure that a worker is trained in all matters that are necessary to protect the health and safety of the worker when the worker:
(a) begins work at a place of employment; or
(b) is moved from one work activity or worksite to another that differs with respect to hazards, facilities or procedures.

(2) The training required by subsection (1) must include:
(a) procedures to be taken in the event of a fire or other emergency;
(b) the location of first aid facilities;
(c) identification of prohibited or restricted areas;
(d) precautions to be taken for the protection of the worker from physical, chemical or biological hazards; (p. 17)
(e) any procedures, plans, policies and programs that the employer is required to develop pursuant to the Act or any regulations made pursuant to the Act that apply to the worker's work at the place of employment; and
(f) any other matters that are necessary to ensure the health and safety of the worker while the worker is at work.

(3) An employer shall ensure that the time spent by a worker in the training required by subsection (1) is credited to the worker as time at work, and that the worker does not lose pay or other benefits with respect to that time.

(4) An employer shall ensure that no worker is permitted to perform work unless the worker:
(a) has been trained, and has sufficient experience, to perform the work safely and in compliance with the Act and the regulations; or
(b) is under close and competent supervision."

4 Oct 96 cO-1.1 Reg 1 s19. (p. 18)

**From: Saskatchewan Ministry of Labour Relations and Workplace Safety (54/2009). *The Occupational Health and Safety Regulations, 1996. Chapter O-1.1 Reg. 1*. WorkSafe Saskatchewan. Regina, Canada: The Queens Printer.